

**TEXT IS CROSS IN
THE BOOK**

914.7	F16
Fairburn	
Russia, the Utopia	
in chains	MAY 32

914.7 F16
Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on his card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



PUBLIC LIBRARY
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in this Pocket

0 0001 0149090 2

7 MAR		
7 APR	89	
28 MAR		
24 JUL	38	3
-14 MAR	38	66
JUN 5 42	60	
DEC 18 42	62	
AUG 11 48	71	

Russia the Utopia in Chains

BY
WILLIAM ARMSTRONG FAIRBURN

Nation Press Printing Co., Inc.
New York

Copyright, 1931

By William Armstrong Fairburn

All rights reserved

DEDICATED
to the
LIBERTY, IDEALS and PROSPERITY
of the
AMERICAN PEOPLE

Contents

	PAGE
I. Communism, The Godless Antithesis of Democracy	1
II. Forced Labor in Soviet Russia . . . (First Printed September 12, 1931)	82
III. Peasant and Perennial Serf . . .	188
IV. The "International" Goal of Russian Communism	241
V. America's Attitude to Soviet Russia— Non-recognition and Embargo . . . (First Printed September 15, 1931)	313
VI. Soviet Russia and America (First Printed May, 1931)	405

I.

COMMUNISM, THE GODLESS ANTITHESIS OF DEMOCRACY

THE Government of Russia is a militaristic dictatorship by a few forceful and arbitrary leaders of a highly-organized and fanatical so-called Communist Party (with a total membership representing less than 11¼ per cent. of the population) who, as unscrupulous opportunists, have usurped ruling power by brutal, inhuman violence and relentlessly hold it by terrorism. This dictatorship is supported by the ranks of so-called proletarian or manual urban labor, organized as trade or labor unions, which are led by a few fanatical proletarian revolutionists and bigoted radical theorists of the so-called intelligentsia and make a privileged class (or pseudoaristocracy) out of certain relatively ignorant, old factory employees, who, with proved proletarian ancestry and full acceptance of an anti-democratic and atheistic "confession of faith," are accepted as members of an exclusive and uniquely privileged Russian Communist Party.

The revolution of the Bolsheviks in Russia, following the collapse of despotic Czarism, with its inhuman serfdom and cruel, social injustice (while that nation was presumably fighting with the Allies "to make the world safe for democracy"—the irony of militarism—and the fiasco of Kerensky's weak, social democratic government), was a victory of blood and iron over a war-weary, hungry, and essentially ignorant people. Lenin and Trotzky, quite

different in temperament one from the other, were the resourceful and unscrupulous leaders of an organized group of zealots who stooped to any and all ferocious and merciless means to obtain the desired end—which was the subjugation of all classes and all peoples by a small party of intelligentsia-led proletarian workers, and the destruction of all whom they could not intimidate and enslave, or of whom they had doubt or fear.

A Soviet is a committee; Soviets antedate the Communist Party in Russia, and "All power to the Soviets" was a rallying cry of the Bolsheviks when they commenced to fool Russia with its supposed "Workers', Peasants', and Soldiers' Soviets" and, later, its Workers' and Peasants' Government, said to be founded on the Soviet system. The government of Russia to-day is not a real government of Soviets (geographical or economic); there is no true working parliament, no free elections, no competition in nominations, and all that is said and broadcast of Soviet elections, "the voice of the people," is merely ballyhoo and "window-dressing." Soviet Russia, the Communist Party and the International are one and all dominated by a dictator and, in the last analysis, unless Stalin wills it, there is no voice but that of Stalin in Russia to-day.

The Russian Soviet symbol is a hammer and a sickle (a typical Lenin touch), but the sickle would not be there if the industrial worker could have lived and "carried on" without the agricultural worker. Bolshevism is the terroristic and deepest "Red" branch of all Russian Revolutionary, Socialistic, or Communist movements. By blood, bodily and mental torture, cruel and bigoted inhumanity,

brutal force, oppression and hunger the Bolsheviks have been and are at war with their Russian fellows, and Soviet Russia, under an absolute and inflexible military dictatorship, is officially said to be "wiping clean the human slate to found the Communist paradise." Is this chimerical Utopia for all men? Decidedly not; but only for the "élite." And who are the favored class? They are practically limited to those factory workers and urban manual laborers who have had the great "boon" of being born proletarians of proletarian parents—and the poorer and more ignorant, the better their standing in the new order of things. In Soviet Russia a new aristocracy of the lowest is being created and developed, and the skilled or unskilled wielder of the hammer is the privileged lord of society.

Democracy says men are born equal in the eyes of the law, and all enjoy inherent rights of freedom and social justice. In Russia, the Proletarian Communists in power have usurped undemocratic priority rights and privileges, and have relegated all one-time aristocrats; middle class, substantial people, or bourgeoisie (above a peasant and below a "gentleman"); merchants, traders, shopkeepers; bankers, brokers, commission men and speculators in securities or commodities; independent, successful or land-owning farmers—both large and small, and no matter how poor; professional men and women; the intelligentsia—who do not talk and write exactly as the dictatorship decrees and who cannot be bought,—and the priests, rabbis, or clergy, etc., to a humiliated and enslaved lower and despised social stratum. The Russian Bolsheviks who sought to exterminate an aristocracy of birth

and privilege, are actually creating a hereditary aristocracy of a restricted number of uncultured and essentially crude, bigoted and fanatical industrial laborers, with their leaders; and history will prove (if the social experiment lasts long enough) that the bitter and heavy dregs will be more obnoxious than the non-substantial foam.

Freedom, with sanctity of human life, individual liberty and choice of action, in harmony with a socially just and moral code of laws, are the fundamental and inherent "rights" of individual man to life, work and the pursuit of happiness. The existence and practical application of individual human liberty differentiates a free-man, or one who enjoys civil, political, economic and religious liberty, from a slave. The free man is the captain of his own soul and is a responsible entity, a distinct and separate individual, with peculiar inherent characteristics and capabilities, that not only claims, but is permitted by the State and his fellows to grow, develop, work, and enjoy the fruits of his labor. Such a man enjoys freedom of speech and freedom of thought; reads a free press in a democratic land of individual freedom, and has freedom of action and of movement, freedom of choice and of bargaining, with individual responsibility as a free person living and functioning under laws sanctioned by him and his fellows, with a minimum of such restrictions as are deemed necessary by good government of, for, and by all the people. Moreover, while such a person, enjoying liberty and protection in a democracy, is law-abiding, he is free "to go and come"; is not intimidated by any coercive authority deputized by government, and is not watched, checked up, or em-

barrassed by sleuths or secret police. If he is accused of a crime he is deemed innocent until he is proven guilty, and he can be condemned and incarcerated only following a trial by a jury consisting of twelve of his fellow men. He cannot, moreover, be deprived of life, unless a jury of his peers finds him guilty of murder in the first degree after he has had a fair and open trial and been defended publicly and competently.

A philosopher said that as free men "we are forced to become unselfish, to a great degree, by the inexorable logic of fate. Expediency presses upon us and crushes us into faith and virtue," and, he adds, "Most men, aside from the lazy, the weak, the criminal, the defective and the tainted, hate the communism of Marx and Lenin. They yearn for something that has the mark of personal ownership—something won by struggle—something to cherish and defend—to use and enjoy. Mankind wants a home and all that clusters around it. This sentiment constitutes the poetry of life, and it dwells in humble surroundings, as in places of wealth and culture."

The United States of America is a free country; its Constitution was enacted by and expresses the will of the people, who are the ultimate source of political power and are supreme in government. This Constitution guarantees the freedom of religion, freedom of speech and of writing, and the freedom of public meeting. With its early amendments or bill of rights, which are in reality part and parcel of the original Constitution as finally adopted, the individual is protected by and in his freedom.

The most enlightened and progressive people in

our modern civilization determined, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, to make an end of aristocracy in every form, and this meant the aristocracy of the mob and of a class, no less than that of a crown with "divine right" prerogatives. Democracy is unalterably opposed and must wage war to the death with any despotic dictator, or with any governing body that is a minority and is held in power by physical force. President Hoover said, "Our political system was a revolt from dictatorship, whether by individuals or classes. It was founded upon the conception that freedom was inalienable; that liberty and freedom should rest on law, and that law should spring from the expressed wisdom of the majority of the people themselves."

The United States was brought into existence by individualist revolutionists who demanded a full measure of liberty, with freedom to live and govern themselves in their own way. America has been created and developed by the work of individualists functioning under the great boon of personal liberty, with governmental sanction, encouragement and support. The freedom of the individual from both political and economic servitude to the State (or from any religious or economic church vassalage—subtle or openly declared) has not only permitted, but promoted and stimulated the interplay of ambition, skill, resourcefulness, initiative and originality of thought and action, without which our American social structure and nation could not have been built.

As religion is not mere conformity to a creed or a declared belief in any church or sect, so is democracy far more than a majority rule or government

by legislators freely elected by the people. Democracy is opportunity and encouragement for individual human development and expression; it is social and collective human power in, and functioning through, the spirit of man. Democracy is proved by the extraordinary possibilities in people of all walks of life and by their accomplishments, when stimulated and protected by their fellows under moral social law and human justice. Our democracy has blundered just as much in the past and is as imperfect to-day as our religion, but, with all its faults of expression and errors in manifestation, democracy is human and essentially spiritual; it will grow and become more and more perfect as the centuries advance. Democracy is real and is founded, not on sentiment or emotionalism, but on fact and on a deep, underlying and all-permeating reality.

An early Communist (Proudhon) wrote, "Slavery is assassination inasmuch as it destroys all that is valuable and desirable in human personality." A Russian writer has recently described his country, under the Stalin "perfect brand" of Marx-Lenin Communism, as "Utopia in chains,"—chimerical and fantastic rather than real, with its schemes for social and economic regeneration not only visionary and impractical, but positively harmful, as bondage, fetters and slavery have supplanted liberty; and bigotry, allied with crude and pitiless force, has crucified human justice. Proudhon also said, "Government of man by man in every form is oppression. The highest perfection of society is found in the union of order and anarchy." This statement, which in the middle of the nineteenth century was considered most radical and revolutionary, is

deemed moderate to-day, for the advocated "anarchy" of a century ago is deemed almost conservatism in these progressive days. Moreover, Proudhon did not use the word "anarchy" to mean revolutionary bloodshed, terrorism and destructive lawlessness, but unrestrained individual freedom developed to the *n*th power. In Russia, to-day, the ruling Communist Party have a destructive and fettered subordination of the individual to the Party, or rather to its dictators. It is anti-freedom; it does not trust individual initiative and enterprise; it does not offer incentives or rewards. Both in and outside the Communist Party in Soviet Russia, the individual has no right to possess his own soul: he is denied freedom of speech, and a censored press enables the dictator to force into the minds of the people only those thoughts which he wishes them to have; therefore, freedom of thought is tabu.

The United States has been brought to the van of peoples and to the foreground of important nations solely because of its liberty guaranteed to all and by the work, under laws expressing this liberty and protection, of real unfettered individualists. This inspiration and substantial encouragement which a free man has been given, in the United States, to use his mind, his hands, and all of his energy and inherent or developed forces in the opportunities he saw before him—or has struggled upward and forced himself to grasp by "worldly" sacrifices and self-denial,—has produced an economic social system (brutally defamed as "capitalistic" because it sanctions private property) from which Russian Communists seek to draw, by fraud, deceit and subtleties, the necessary expert knowledge to create

and establish an entirely different and opposing system.

The Communists preach and teach: Hatred of God and all forms of religion; destruction of private property, earned or inherited, and of all individual rights; promotion of class discord and hatred, and the subjugation of the best—the so-called upper and middle, cultured, educated, or successful; revolutionary propaganda in foreign countries, in order to produce riots, strikes, bloodshed and civil war; the destruction of all governments, all civil and political rights, the freedom of the press, speech, thought and the right of assembly, protection from search and arrest, and trial by jury; and yet they decry “slavery” and class consciousness. They boast of a freedom that they do not and cannot possibly possess, and of a social equality and justice that they repudiate to a greater and more horrible extreme than any autocratic despot who ever lived. It is freedom, not slavery, that Communism assassinates, and government of man by man as exemplified by the dictatorship of the Soviet Union is the world’s greatest, cruellest and most inhuman form of godless and hopeless oppression.

The Bolshevik Revolution was not aimed at despotic Czarism, with all its inhuman abuses; that had passed. It was directed against a Social Democratic Provisional Government that was seeking to gain strength, restore order, and make of Russia a democratic, free people. The Revolution was not aimed at the aristocrats or the upper class, but at the middle class or bourgeoisie. The Bolshevik October Revolution—that commenced in 1917 and is still continuing fourteen years later—was pri-

marily and emphatically a revolution against the middle class and their world—economic, social, spiritual. It was aimed at the class of people in Russia and throughout the world of the type, education, breeding, wealth, culture and ideals of the average working American.

The U.S.S.R. (Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics) is neither socialistic nor republican in either spirit or fact. Whereas socialism demands the governmental control of economic activities to the end that competition shall give way to co-operation, it also requires and insists that the opportunities of life and its privileges, with individual human rights and liberty, shall be uniformly free and guaranteed to all and that the reward for labor performed shall be equitably apportioned. In a socialistic state all men should be free and equal. In a republic, the sovereign power resides in its citizens and is exercised by representatives freely elected by (and responsible to) them. Russia has no "free" elections; no secret or any other form of recorded ballot; no parties to present rival, competing candidates. All Soviet so-called elections—few and of no importance—are mere abhorrent shams, with the Communist Party in full control of every phase at all times, and with the dreaded G. P. U. in evidence to direct and restrain by persuasive force and, if necessary, terrorize, arrest, exile, or make away with refractory or non-submissive souls. A real republic is essentially democratic, with government of, by, and for the people, and with supreme power vested in and exercised by all the people—without regard to class or wealth.

The Russian Soviets, copying after Lenin, often

use the word "socialistic" inadvisedly and erroneously, as they also at times refer to "democracy" and "republics," but words mean nothing to the Communists. Real Socialism, however, is opposed to Communism, as it is to Capitalism, and can be considered as one of the three principal social and economic systems of the world. Whereas Capitalism stands for the private ownership of the means of production under a system of free and open competition and encourages individual industry and initiative, with personal reward for accomplishment, all under democratic and socially just laws, but with a minimum of governmental domination and interference; and whereas Communism stands for State ownership and control "of all the means of production, distribution and exchange under a dictatorship of the proletariat" or manual (and urban or industrial) working class, Socialism theoretically aims at "the gradual socialization of the principal means of production, by consent rather than by compulsion and by constitutional (parliamentary) action, through constructive evolutionary processes rather than by sudden or violent revolution." Communism in Russia to-day is a sort of mongrel state capitalism parading in a threadbare coat of Socialism which deceives no one. Such capitalism, with no competition and absolutely no freedom or voice for the workers, is slavery.

The Soviet Union of Russia is fundamentally and avowedly a class state, ruled by a dictator who controls the personnel and the activities of committees which supposedly represent the proletariat or industrial working class, but actually have allegiance only to a close corporation known as the Communist

Party, of which Stalin is the despotic leader.

The Soviet régime is positively anti-democratic in both its theories and manifestations. It ridicules the doctrine of the inherent rights of man which has led, through revolutions by the people of certain lands, to the overthrow of absolute monarchies, despotic rulers and tyrannical dictators in the past. It derides, as "bourgeois piffle," the democratic claim that the franchise and access to public office are the rights of every citizen who has not been adjudged by his fellows as either morally or mentally incompetent. Besides insane persons and criminals, the Soviet Constitution disfranchises and bars from public office all people who employ hired labor; persons receiving earnings from property, profits from enterprises, interest on capital, or any income not derived from physical toil; private merchants, traders, brokers and speculators in securities, physical properties or commodities; commission men and all commercial middlemen; priests, rabbis, monks, ministers, clergymen or ecclesiastics of any and all religious creeds, sects or churches; bankers; industrialists; factory owners; agriculturists and landowners; property holders, such as the Kulaks or upper class of peasants, and the Seredniaks or poorer middle-class peasants; aristocrats, plutocrats and all so-called privileged classes of the old Czarist régime; employees and agents of the old police, and all persons who formerly directed the activity of the police, gendarmes and punitive organs; officers of the anti-Bolshevik armies, etc.

All those in the Soviet Union who, by reason of former association, economic interest, or general cast of mind, might be expected to be hostile toward

the building of a so-called communist and collectivistic order—under the domination of a small minority of crude proletarians—are barred from citizenship and “deprived.” They are branded as “undesirable vestiges of the capitalistic order”; they are not wanted and must be made to disappear—somehow.

The Communist method of handling “undesirables” of both the political and economic realms is diabolical and inhuman to an extreme. All such are branded enemies of the proletariat; and in order to be crushed and made to suffer, to the greatest possible degree during the ordeal, they are denied work, or any open and relatively decent way of making a living or of obtaining means of maintenance; they are refused passports (for themselves or even for their families) to leave the country; they are cut off from friends at home and from all foreigners; they are suspected, shadowed and hounded by spies; and because of their beliefs and one-time social, economic, professional, or academic standing, they are condemned to see their families and innocent children treated as moral lepers and outcasts. Russia, for them, is and must be one vast barricaded prison-house, from which the only escape is death.

By means of an essentially unjust, unscrupulous and diabolical campaign of “education” and bigoted propaganda, reeking with falseness—which reaches out to all parts and remote corners of the State,—the old and solid pillars of capitalistic society, the sound and conservative bourgeois (hard-working and constructive), and the professional and educated classes (as well as the useless aristocracy and the selfish plutocrats) are made to appear in a despica-

ble rôle as "enemies of the people, exploiters of the poor and afflicted," and as "cruel vampires living on the blood of the masses."

The disfranchised people in Russia are looked upon as criminals. They are incarcerated or exiled in groups with malefactors—thieves and murderers,—and there is no distinction between "political" prisoners and lawless felons; both are depraved creatures, but the felon is more readily excused and has a better chance to "get off," particularly if he has proletarian blood in him. Whether a Russian murders a man or is merely guilty of opposition in thought to the Communists, he is equally culpable in the eyes of Soviet law and is guilty of "grossly immoral conduct," or "grievous social perversion." Almost any man in Russia can be quickly put "in wrong" with the authorities. The prevalent and common charge of "counter-revolution," so frequently appealed to when it seems desirable to remove men from a community, as defined by the Soviet legal code covers even "the unfulfilment of duties," as well as "actions directed to help" the bourgeoisie. One cannot do any free thinking in Russia. To be orthodox and live is to be a communist, or in full working sympathy with Communism. To be heterodox is punishment, persecution, imprisonment, banishment, or death. To passively hold "heretical views" is quaintly branded by the Soviets "connection with an alien element"—and that cannot be tolerated in Russia.

The classes and the individuals who held any measure of wealth (no matter how honestly and with social justice acquired), of privilege, and of social esteem have become in Russia the despised, humili-

ated and subjugated caste of the disfranchised. W. H. Chamberlain, in "Soviet Russia—A Living Record and a History," rightly says, "Disfranchisement is a much more serious penalty in Russia than it might be in other countries, because Soviet legislation and practice tend to make the Lishentsi, or persons deprived of the right to vote, veritable pariahs of the community. A person who is disfranchised cannot join a workers' union and cannot be employed in any state office or undertaking; his children cannot attend the higher or middle schools; he is charged double rates for accommodations, for public or semi-public services, and even for medical treatment, and his life is made as uncomfortable as legislative and social discrimination can make it." In 1927, a total of 3,111,903 persons were admittedly disfranchised in the Soviet Union, of which 70 per cent. (2,170,929) were country folk. More recently, because of the intensified class war aimed particularly against the Kulaks and middle classes, together with Stalin's orders to "strictly scrutinize the qualifications of every voter," the number of the disfranchised, if honestly announced, would show a tremendous increase.

Any man who is deprived of the privilege and opportunity to work in Russia, either by disfranchisement or dismissal, is virtually condemned to death by starvation and exposure, and all men and women in the Soviet Union who refuse to bend the knee to the decrees of the Communist dictator are sooner or later outlawed. Not only have known aristocrats, with influential and rich men of the old Czarist régime, been "thrown to the lions" by the ruling Communists—with their so-called "Workers' and Peas-

ants' Government" and a new privileged aristocratic class of the proletariat,—but scholars, scientists and men of genius; leaders of industry, commerce and business; highly-trained and competent professional men; ecclesiastics of every belief, church and creed, and even socialists, communists and anarchists, together with every form and type of radical proletarian revolutionists that differ from Marx-Lenin-Stalin Bolshevism—with either theories of bloody force or of peaceful ballot reform—have been disfranchised and (1) deprived of their means of securing food, as they are not eligible or entitled to be provided with work and therefore cannot secure bread cards or food books, or else (2) exiled on some flimsy charges, under prison guards, to Siberia, or (3) summarily executed.

The most damnable phase of the operation of Soviet communist "justice" is its effect upon innocent children, the offspring of the "deprived" and the unfortunate. Not only are the members of the disfranchised classes themselves hounded, persecuted, and transformed into embittered and pitiful pariahs and "internal émigrés," but their children are all put under the ban and branded as social lepers; they are denied educational opportunities, are discriminated against if they seek employment, and are constantly subjected to scorn and abuse as "outcasts." Yet Russia boasts that all peoples are equal without regard to race, color, or religion. The Soviet boon of equality extended to black and yellow races, to civilized and savage people—even to the cannibal—is not granted to the innocent and harmless children of the middle and upper classes—the despised bourgeoisie. The proletarian com-

munists are not only devilishly vindictive, inhuman and cruel beyond words, but they must feel very insecure in their position of despotic dictatorship when they fear the little brains of well-born and tenderly-nurtured children.

In Leningrad, quite recently, the Government announced a shortage of translators and interpreters and asked all people who were competent and qualified to register. It is said that about 2,500 well educated, of the so-called bourgeoisie and intelligentsia, registered and then found it was a mere ruse of the G. P. U. to ferret out the learned and undesirable; for all lost their jobs and were driven to swell the ranks of the beggars and "that heart-rending array of human wrecks who sit in gutters in loathsome rags or skulk in church doorways, pitifully begging for a piece of bread."

Whereas Russian Communism is, admittedly, today a class dictatorship, with the urban or industrial proletariat supreme, nevertheless Communism is supposedly the abolition of all classes. Lenin wrote, "The purpose of the dictatorship is to establish Socialism; to put an end to the division of society into classes." The Russians say that the ideal can never be reached until the objective of the Communist International is achieved and the Communist Social Order exists, not in Russia alone, but throughout the whole world. In the meanwhile, the great majority of the Russian masses, the middle classes and the one-time upper classes are enslaved under the cruel and inhuman yoke of a low-caste, vindictive, ambitious and unscrupulous dictator.

The principles and practices of the Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics are diametrically opposed

to the principles and practices as established under the Government of the United States of America. Soviet Russia is ruled by an arbitrary dictatorship which is not, as claimed, "a dictatorship of the proletariat," but a dictatorship of Stalin, with a small body of fervid zealots, backed by the G. P. U., or Cheka (or secret police, organized along Czarist Okhrana lines), and supported by the Red Army. Gregory Zinovieff, once head of the Third International, a member of the Executive Committee, and a prominent leader of the Soviet Government and of the Russian Communist Party (one of an interlocking directorate—often crudely camouflaged), declared, "The Red Army and the Cheka build the fame of, and the respect due, the Communist Party." The Red Army is the dictator's weapon that is ever visible, protective, suggestive and menacing that, together with the secret police and subtle, unscrupulous and terroristic G. P. U., keeps the Communist Party in power and the dictator on his throne.

The Russian Revolution was a gangster, street-fighting, and highly-organized racketeer affair on a large scale. The Communist doctrine is, "We can never gain power by the ballot or in legislative halls, so let us take to the streets and fight." The intelligentsia and much-talking Parlor Socialists of America and of other democratic lands—who seldom earn their own living or know by personal experience what they talk so much about—incessantly refer to the "philosophy" of the Russian Soviet movement and the International revolution. They might just as well theorize over the "philosophy" of our American big-city gangsters; of the "philos-

ophy" of bandits, raiders, despoilers, murderers and exterminators of their kind; of the "philosophy" of Genghis Khan and other brutal Huns, and their kind—including the advocates of the "might makes right" junkers responsible for the invasion and ravaging of Belgium. Philosophy searches for truth; Communism repudiates truth and grabs for power. Philosophy reasons; Communism subjugates by force or kills.

Maurice Hindus, who was born in Russia and came to the United States at the age of fourteen, in "Humanity Uprooted" (1931) describes the proletarian, the new "aristocrat," or favored and privileged class in Russia: "He was the dweller in the slums . . . more individualized than the Muzhik, more worldly, more decisive. . . . An elementary man of simple tastes, simple thoughts, simple manners, and he was not overly diligent. You see him in a shop or a factory and you perceive instantly why it was that Russia had given birth to such sayings as 'Work loves a fool,' or 'Work is no wolf, it will not run away to the woods.' He had not the ingrained sense of duty or honesty found in the make-up of working men of certain other nationalities. He dallied when he could; he loafed when he dared . . . he imbibed more profusely than did the Muzhik . . . he was a desperate fellow always. He asked for no quarter and gave none. He never shrank from battle, and when he fought he hit above or below the belt, he scratched, he bit, he kicked. He fought to hurt, to bleed, to overpower. He followed no rules save those of his immediate wrath, and he could receive blows as well as deal them. Down on the ground, face scratched, clothes tat-

tered, gasping with impotence, he would not admit defeat and would not plead for mercy. . . . Less than any other proletarian in Europe was he actuated by a hope to be his own master at some future time. . . . He was a man without political experience. . . . Not only his lack of education, but his social antecedents mitigated against his rise to prominence in political life. . . . Through the revolutionary propaganda, disseminated in his midst, he learned more than a peasant of the importance of political action, but his experience was no greater and he had a peasant's innate hostility toward all government. He was a man without background, without culture, without breeding, without political experience, without a social tradition, and with a body of not especially laudable personal habits . . . a rough-spoken, unmannered, uncultivated creature." And in the present tense we read, "He is still woefully lacking in the rudiments of good behavior. He is still addicted to the vilest language in the world and to alcoholism. Alas, what a ghoulish drinker he is! He still has no respect, not to say reverence, for human individuality. He is still rough and callous and reckless in his treatment of others, especially non-proletarians. Where else in the world is there, for example, such constant arguing and wrangling as in Russia? . . . Everywhere, with the exception of places in command of the old intelligentsia, there is incessant bickering and brandishing of fists. . . . His class consciousness and his fighting spirit are ever inflated to a point of explosion. He is easily roused to wrath and desperation. He has quaffed deep of power and privilege, and he will fight to death against efforts to deprive him of either. . . . Now that he has

a personal stake, a vested interest in the new society, he will give freely of his blood to fight off all invaders."

Gorki, when he visited Russia in the summer of 1928, we are told, "was openly chagrined at the spirit of sullenness he observed in the land, as though the proletarian was perpetually out of humor. The attribute of the Russian proletarian, with its saturnine churlishness, has been intensified rather than lessened by his rise to power. He has no breeding and no background to stand and use political and executive power, to live on a plane of equality with any but the very lowest, and as he inwardly senses, but won't admit, his coarseness, uncouthness, inferiority and lack of real substance, he develops suspicions, jealousies, disquietude and apprehensions, and grows increasingly boorish and morose, splenetic and quarrelsome."

And this is the man whom the Communist Party has decreed shall seemingly rule Russia and, moreover, form, numerically, a substantial majority of the dominant Communist Party. All Soviet officials, excepting certain intelligentsia who are "in right" with Stalin, the dictator, are of proletarian origin and recruited from the ranks. As Hindus says, "in the judiciary, in industry, in the co-operatives, in the school system—everywhere, the proletarian has been lifted to heights of authority of which he never dreamed."

The word "proletarian" in Russia, to-day, is the symbol of power, of eminence, of mastery, and of glory. We hear of proletarian justice, which means proletarian advantage, preference and protection; of proletarian civilization, which means "might

makes right," and the ethics of the jungle; of proletarian culture, which means not only the deification of crude materialism, but the repudiation of all that is spiritual, enlightening, developing and refining. The Communists say that the proletarian is not ruined by either imagination or sensitiveness. He is mere animated physical matter himself, and physical things alone interest him; it is easy, therefore, for him to grasp the materialist theory of life, which is the corner-stone of collectivist society.

Marx said that labor produces all wealth and is, therefore, entitled to the control of its distribution. This thought, simply expressed and often repeated, appeals to the proletarian and makes him easy to dominate by the Communists. It is surprising, however, that a small minority of factory laborers (not necessarily the skilled artisans) are considered the producers of "all wealth" and "entitled to control its distribution," when some five or more peasants in Russia, for every one urban proletarian, are producing wealth with nature's aid and stand unrecognized by the Communists except to the degree of being subjugated and oppressed.

The proletarian is a fighting tool or medium in the hands of a few Communist and revolutionary intelligentsia. A virtual absence of a higher nature makes possible the development of a distinctive class consciousness, and he is easily organized, aroused and thrown into bitter conflict with the capitalistic or bourgeois classes. "He can be better held together by a common purpose for a common destiny; he is, therefore, the natural carrier of the class struggle, the ideal builder of the new society"; and he is promised, in the communist battle and rally hymn, the

Internationale, "Ye that are nothing shall have everything." Communist dictatorship, working through an aristocracy of proletarian scum, "aspires" to make a new earth—and do away with heaven.

In the maelstrom of Communism, as exemplified in Russia to-day, there is nothing sure or fixed except the dictator, who holds himself in power by sheer courage, despotism, the G.P.U. and the Red Army. He is king, political boss, chief gangster, all in one; but all down the line of the Communist Party, in the trade unions, and wherever the proletariat meet and work, there is no peace, no real happiness, no calm security, for Communism proceeds along the lines that nothing is secure; that the proletariat (the favored) are not to be fully trusted, and that the members of the Party themselves have to be watched and checked up. Russia is a country at war with itself. The entire mental and physical environment and the all-permeating psychological attitude suggest war-time sacrifices and war-time hysteria to "win the war." Conversation is military; industry and agriculture are militarized; workers, including women and children, are conscripted; food is rationed, and many needed items of food, clothing and household supplies cannot be obtained at all; drives are persistent for "victory" war bonds; spies honeycomb the populace; soldiers parade the streets; industrial victories are celebrated by pageants, and crowds gather and sing the battle hymn, Internationale.

Communism is not human, brotherly, sympathetic, merciful, or uplifting; it is characteristically ruthless, bigoted and "hard boiled." The real power

in Communism (Russian and International) is highly concentrated. George S. Counts, in "The Soviet Challenge to America" (1931) says, "During the past year or two, the Western press, in describing and explaining events in the Union, has referred daily to the dictatorship of Joseph Stalin. While this is no doubt a convenient and picturesque method of reporting, and while it does bear a semblance of truth, it fails to do justice to the facts. There is most certainly a dictatorship in Soviet Russia to-day, but it is not a personal dictatorship; it is not a dictatorship of any one man or of any small group of men; it is a dictatorship of the Communist Party. This organization is not a mere mechanism in the hands of an autocrat; on the contrary, it is an organism throbbing with life in every one of its thousands of separate cells." Stalin is, of course, no more of a personal and autocratic dictator than is Mussolini, and has little if any more despotic power than had Napoleon, but he is infinitely more of a dictator than was Genghis Khan, the Mongol conqueror, Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, or any of the old czars. Notwithstanding the gullibility and trustfulness of many members of the intelligentsia, who ignore truth as revealed by operation and accept all "explanations" as satisfactory and conclusive—if the sources from which they emanate are either authoritative or radical,—it is apparent to any practical student of politics, sociology, or economics that Russia to-day (the Soviet Union) and the Communist movement throughout the world (the International) are dominated by one force—the Communist Party,—and this one force

is controlled by a well backed-up and supported dictator, Stalin.

Calvin B. Hoover, in "The Economic Life of Soviet Russia" (Macmillan Co., N. Y.), the most conservative and unbiased of all thoroughly competent academic economists who have lived in Russia in harmony with the Communists (as a Fellow of the Social Science Research Council in the Soviet Union in 1929-30) and was freely "fed up" to satiation with facts, figures and explanations of conditions by the authorities; who was close to the Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, and who came in close and intimate relations with Soviet officials and communists at work, says, "The present régime in Russia is not alone a dictatorship of the proletariat, not even a dictatorship of the Communist Party; it is also a dictatorship of the Stalin group within the Party. The régime is founded upon force and upon discipline, and this is as true of the economic organization as of the political." Moreover, Mr. Hoover affirms that the Communists under Stalin's leadership, which is a dictatorship, control industry "not alone through control of the Government and the Labor Unions, but directly through the mechanism of the Party itself," and we are told that "it is impossible to imagine Soviet Russia without the great source of power, force and fanaticism which is the Communist Party." What the Fascist organization is to Mussolini, the Communist Party is to Stalin.

It is interesting to note that Socialism, with its great claims of equality, admits to-day that "any socialistic order must depend upon force rather than upon inducement"; Socialists also infer that in their

Utopia any tyranny existent would be that of a majority over the minority,—but this sounds more like Democracy, with its majority rule, than Socialism, with its theoretical monotony of uniformity. In Soviet Russia, however, there is no tyranny of the majority, but a dictatorship functioning through an extremely small, but highly-organized, minority, and this Communist and so-called socialistic régime could not maintain itself on any basis except that of ruthless despotism, with its force and terrorism.

In Russia, democracy and the soul of the individual man are crucified; all religion is repudiated and its followers persecuted. The vast and overwhelming majority of the people are enslaved and terrorized, not by kings or plutocrats, but by a group of lowly and ignorant factory-working proletarians, galvanized into action and lifted into power by a few bigoted theorists and destroyers of the intelligentsia. The masses and all classes in Russia, other than possibly a small, favored group, are learning the bitter truth that oppression is not less hateful in the hands of the low, working class than in the hands of a tyrannous king; and a revolution that merely leads to a change of masters, with the fitting of new chains to still further destroy human liberty and increase human suffering, injustice and despair, is of the devil. "Better by far," cries out an educated Russian middle-class industrialist, "life under an intolerant aristocratic despot than under the cruel, destructive and revengeful tyranny of heartless proletarian scum."

Lenin and his closest associates and followers in the Communist Party and International (members of a half-baked, unbalanced and intolerant "intelli-

gentsia") profess, at least, to consider Karl Heinrich Marx (1818-1883), the German-Jewish Socialist, as their master, "inspiration," and a sort of patron saint—or devil. Marx—head of the International Working Men's Association—was a scholar and a so-called radical. He was not so original as is generally believed, but followed the thought of earlier English and of several contemporaneous French socialists. Proudhon (1809-1865), well known for his roughness, one-sidedness and exaggeration, wrote, "Property is theft" in 1840, and attacked the Church and all religious or kindred institutions in 1858. Marx was jealous of the Frenchman's social, economic and political revolutionary ideas, detested him and attacked his written word rather than the underlying thought. Marx was greatly assisted by Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), the son of a wealthy cotton spinner, who was, in fact, his collaborator. He belonged to a Communist society of German workers who ironically named themselves, "The League of the Just." In conjunction with Engels, Marx produced the Manifesto of Communism in 1847; a year later, revolutions broke out in France, Germany, and other countries, and Marx, accused of treason in 1849, was exiled from Germany, later ordered out of France, and finally found sanctuary in England, where he wrote "Das Kapital" in 1867, and obtained the means of support in his later years by writing radical articles for—among others—a prominent New York paper whose staff, at the time, consisted of so-called "advanced democrats" and socialists of the Fourierist school. Marx, the teacher of agitators and revolutionists, was not in name, but in fact the head of the

International (founded in London in 1864), the General Council of which was moved to New York in 1872, but was dissolved in Philadelphia four years later.

Prof. Nicholas Jorga, a philosophical historian and Premier of Roumania, says that Bolshevism is based, to a great degree, on Marxism, and that Marxism is not only old-fashioned, it is obsolete. It is not applicable to the conditions existing to-day in our mechanized age and, as an economic and social theory, is dead. Moreover, Jorga says Marxism was old when first given its great publicity more than eighty years ago, and he maintains that it is but a rehash of the economic revolutionary theories of an earlier century—more recently expressed by the propagandist, Jean Baptiste (1767-1832) and the relatively contemporaneous theories and writings of the earlier life of Michel Chevalier (1806-1879) and of Proudhon (1809-1865). "As a historian," says Jorga, "I have analyzed the theory, motive and goal of Bolshevism and have come to the conclusion that it is a strange mixture of Marx and Genghis Khan (1162-1227), the Mongolian terroristic conqueror, who, at the sacrifice of six million lives, extended his empire into the heart of Europe" and ruled, at his death, from the China Sea to the banks of the Dnieper. It is significant that Genghis Khan, after he had conquered all of China, cast his eyes westward toward the Europe of to-day and wrote to the Shah, his powerful neighbor, "I take it that we have an equal interest in encouraging trade between our subjects." This trade led, ultimately, to unspeakable horrors and atrocities, with cruel butchery and devilish destruction on a scale never before deemed

possible. The hordes from the East devastated the lands and uprooted the culture of many European and Eurasian peoples. "The hay is cut," shouted Genghis as he encouraged his followers to plunder and to infamies worse than death, "give your horses fodder." Will history repeat itself?

Marx's "philosophy" is based upon a materialistic or economic interpretation of history, and he holds that the prime influence which shapes the progress of society is the system of production or the way men make their living. Marx's labor theory of value and of surplus value are not deemed worthy of much consideration to-day, except by a few bigoted Jesuitic Communists. Marx was a sociologist; he was not a scientific economist and to-day is an old-fashioned protagonist of a system that feels the need of a figurehead gleaned from a turbulent past.

George S. Counts, in "The Soviet Challenge to America" (1931), says that five great concepts occupy a dominant position in the Communist Revolutionary movement, and he enumerates them as "Dialectical Materialism; Collectivism; Equality of Nationalities; Equality of Sexes, and Industrialization." The first of these five stated concepts is what democratic and spiritually-minded people positively refuse to accept, and no compromise is possible. Collectivism, with human individual justice, opportunity and encouragement—that would be accepted as an ideal by a democrat—is not collectivism to a Communist. The Equality of Nationalities of all races, of all peoples and, moreover, of all classes, is a doctrine of both democracy and true religion; the Communists do not accept and acknowledge in practice an equality of classes—

they make the proletarian and the lowest into an exclusive and privileged class, dominating all other classes. Equality of sexes is demanded by social justice and is rapidly being realized in progressive democratic countries without the brutalizing of women and without the female sex being deprived of certain peculiar privileges which are its due. Industrialization means efficiency, with economic production, and, in this respect, the ideal of Communism is to reach to the heights of accomplishment attained by the world's largest democratic nation; democracy, however, will not tolerate the worship of the machine, the subordination of the worker to the machine, and the industrialization of human beings; this is what Communism stands for and insists upon in its practical operation in Russia to-day. Dialectical Materialism means simply a banishing of God from the universe, a denial of the existence of a Supreme Being, force, or power, of a creative and sustaining mind, and of the soul of man. Matter is everything—the foundation of all existence. Matter, we are told, is not a product of mind, but mind is a product of matter.

"Dialectical" materialism adds nothing and takes nothing away from the crude doctrine of materialism; it merely seeks, by words, to justify and explain prejudice, injustice and error. It mixes evolutionary theories with an economic interpretation of history; it says that human behavior is determined entirely by economic forces and selfishness; that society is divided into classes, based solely upon possession of property; that those who have property are bourgeois, selfish and socially "bad"; that those who have no property are proletarians, un-

selfish and socially "good"; that the bourgeoisie extol the virtue of private property, individual initiative, democracy, "laissez-faire" and religion; that the proletariat demand expropriation of all bourgeois property and that it be owned and used collectively (theoretically by all people, actually by the proletariat); that religion is mere superstition—an opiate for the people,—and that morals are bourgeois prejudices.

The real ideology of Russian Communism is the class hatred and avarice of the under dog, expounded and justified by Marx, the German Jew, and an ever-present endorsing, explaining and justifying intelligentsia, with more words than balance, elaborated upon and applied by the revolutionist, Lenin, a great practical opportunist. The explanation of the movement is a desire for power and absolute control. The "philosophy" of the movement is to gain and relentlessly hold such power and control, in positive opposition to the wishes of others (who constitute a vast majority), by cruel, bloody force, unscrupulousness, inhumanity and diabolical terrorism, with the extermination and destruction of all combative or non-conforming classes and elements. Such an "idealistic" movement naturally could not tolerate the existence of a God, a Spirit or a Supreme Being, so it became necessary to banish God from the Communist Utopia and both ridicule and repudiate all religion and the real philosophic beliefs of mankind.

Marx was an advocate of violent revolution, followed by iron dictatorship. "From the first hour of victory, the workers must level their distrust against their former allies." There must be neither compas-

sion nor remorse, but all opponents must be forcibly terrorized into submission "by execution, imprisonment, forced labor, control of the press. . . . Revolution is war, and war is founded on terror." Bukharin writes, in his text-book on Socialism, "Why do we need the dictatorship? We need it for the organized destruction of the bourgeois régime; we need it that we may crush the enemies of the proletariat by force. Quite openly we say, by force. The dictatorship is the ax in the hands of the proletariat. Any one who is opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat is one who is afraid of decisive action, is afraid of hurting the bourgeoisie, is no revolutionist. . . . As long as the life and death struggle continues it is absolutely incumbent upon the working class to crush its enemies utterly." Lenin, commenting on Marx's "dictatorship of the proletariat" in "Russian Soviet Republics," says that the phrase really means the "dictatorship of its determined and conscious minority." Under Stalin the minority has become quite small and is very determined and very conscious.

Marx theorized about "the elimination of class distinctions," but Lenin, Trotzky and Stalin have shown, and are now showing, Russia and the world what Communist words mean in practice. Soviet Russia's plan "to eliminate class distinctions" is to exterminate all but the lowest proletarian, factory workers and some of the peasants (excluding, of course, the essentially ignorant and mentally lopsided intelligentsia, who are responsible for the revolution and for Communism itself). In Russia, the "byvshi lyudi," which means "the people who were," are condemned and are disappearing; the survivors,

to-day, are "the living dead"—phantoms of the past in the Soviet present. Bukharin, as Lenin's spokesman, when writing "A B C of Communism," encouraged the Kulaks to work and become bigger and better farmers for the benefit of themselves and their country. A few years later, Stalin inaugurated the Communist policy of "the liquidation of the Kulak as a class," and a million families, with some five million human beings—the best, most intelligent, most energetic, most experienced and most successful of the nation's agriculturists (who also owned some land with improvements, equipment and stock),—were arbitrarily ordered dispossessed, dispersed, demolished and liquidated," i.e., washed away or exterminated.

Walter Duranty says, "Here is the supreme justification, from the Bolshevik angle, of the cruel and often bloody pressure upon the 'Former People' or 'class enemies' from czar to kulak. Where Marxism theorized, Stalinism acts. Marxism says, 'Eliminate class distinction,' and Stalinism does so by the simple and effective process of destruction, as Tamerlane destroyed his enemies and made huge pyramids of the skulls of his victims, or the Hebrew prophet 'hewed Agag in pieces' for the glory of Jehovah. It is hard and horrible for twentieth century America to hear this, but facts are facts. Stalinism not only aims, but boasts of aiming at the complete smashing of class boundaries, at the death of all distinctions," and, again, commenting on what becomes of the "Former People," one-time property holders and employers of labor, engineers or Kulaks, ordered to be liquidated or doomed to perish, Duranty writes, "They take a kulak or other type of

'former' individualism—a private business man or self-seeking engineer—and send him to the northern woods or Siberian construction camps. Sometimes his family goes, too. More generally, it remains to be absorbed by poverty into the lower proletarian surroundings. Then they tell him: 'You outcast! You man that was, and now is not! You may get back your civic rights and become a proletarian; you may become an active member of our ant-heap by working for and with us for our communal purpose. If you don't, we may not actually kill you, but you won't eat much, you won't be happy, but will remain forever an outsider, an enemy, because in this sub-Communist ant-heap those who are not with us are against us, and the final fate of such enemies is death.' "

Educated and the once-successful people in Russia, if well born or of the aristocratic and bourgeois, or middle, classes, can never become members of the ruling Communist Party—the élite and new aristocracy of Russia; for such an honor they must be proletarians, born of proletarians, and the more common and vulgar the stock, the better. However, if their "reformation" is sincere and proven to the satisfaction of their Communist proletarian masters, they may be permitted the boon of so-called citizenship, which carries with it the right to join certain labor unions, get food and shelter, and vote in assemblies under the direction and dictation of the Communist Party, with the election conducted by and under the immediate supervision of the dreaded terroristic G. P. U.—voting consisting only of raising the hands to express approval of a program submitted by Communist authority (with no com-

petition or opposition tolerated), and this when directly under the eyes of spies and secret police.

There is no class in Russia that has a special position on account of wealth ownership. "Power, influence and authority," says Calvin B. Hoover, "are not accorded to fools, incompetents and mediocrities in the Soviet Union simply on account of the possession of wealth. Fanatics, toadies and bullies do attain to power in the Soviet system, and, in the case of fanatics at least, much more frequently than in the capitalistic world." It is very apparent that the masses, the people in general, and the country as a whole have not been benefited one iota by a transfer of political and ruling power from an upper class of aristocrats and plutocrats under a czar to a lower class of proletarian zealots, drunk with power, who rule under a Communist dictator. As far as civilization is concerned, Soviet Russia is infinitely further away from the Utopia of philosophers than many of the world's most progressive democratic-capitalistic countries.

Marx, the intellectual creator of what we call Communism to-day, was contemptuous of Utopias, but Socialist intelligentsia generally, either dishonestly or in sublime ignorance of fundamentals, are looking to Russia to see a great ideal practically demonstrated. Imagine men living "the ideal life," freed from all meanness, envy, greed, bitterness, cruelty and vindictiveness, in brutal, materialistic Russia, where, to-day, terrorism and pitiless savage force hold sway. In a Utopia all men would be free, co-operative and in harmony as spiritual brothers. In Russia, no man is free, God is banished, and there is and can be no harmony, as well as no

liberty, equality and fraternity when the entire State is ruled by arbitrary despotism functioning through a small, privileged class. Communism has not brought peace to Russia, but a sword; not happiness, but misery; not spiritual progress, but retrogression; not order, but chaos; not truth, but falsehood; not justice, but caprice, bias and privilege; not freedom, but chains.

It has been well said that the struggle for power has replaced, in Russia, the struggle for wealth—and the change is not for the better. Social conditions in every capitalistic country can and should be improved, particularly with respect to hereditary privileges—both social position and wealth,—but Russia was well down, and either on or near the bottom of the scale of so-called Christian nations, from a standpoint of individual human justice and freedom, at the time of the World War and the 1917 Russian Revolution. The need of social reform was infinitely greater in Russia than in any other European country, and yet Russia, the essentially and persistently stupid and non-progressive “divine right” autocracy, who hated democracy and enslaved her people, was supposedly fighting in the war “to make the world safe for democracy.” What a farce, and what an opportunity for Red revolutionists—which they saw and embraced.

From the first, the leaders of different shades of “Red” have struggled for power. Lenin won; at his death he was succeeded by Stalin, and Trotzky—his rival and Lenin’s old team-mate—is banished. Down the line and all through the Party there has been, and continues to be, an insatiable appetency

for power. Deprived of money rewards, the Communists struggle, scheme and fight for power. Calvin B. Hoover says, "The struggle for power has replaced the struggle for wealth. Within the State Trusts and Commissariats, within the Party, the struggle for power is sharper than within the institution of capitalism. The orthodox Party member to-day finds to-morrow that his orthodoxy has been successfully attacked by a fellow Party member who hates or fears him, and he is ruthlessly expelled from the Party. . . . The Chistka (cleaning) is used in every institution in Russia to give full rein to suspicion, envy and sadism."

In the Soviet Union, rewards for success are relatively great, but the penalty for failure is most severe and often outrageously unjust. Success in the realm of Communism (with the Party) means advancement, and advancement means power, with its perquisites—openly acquired and used, or subtly obtained, with their possession and use winked at. "The desire for power," it is said, "burns fiercely in the breast of the typical Communist. The energy in the capitalistic world which finds expression in the struggle for wealth, for social position, for the comforts of life, in Soviet Russia is canalized in the struggle for power," and we are told that "the opportunity for the conquest of power by a man of any force or ability, who is a Party member, is limitless" provided he is a conformist, obeys orders, switches quickly when directed, is fervid and ruthless, and is loyal to the Communist dictator.

There is absolutely no sign or suggestion of real brotherhood in Russia, not even among the Communist Party and the proletarians. They stand and

work together against a common enemy for policy sake. They have a highly-organized and working unity of purpose, for they well know that "united we conquer; divided we fall"; but they have no love for each other, and but little confidence. They are opportunist, and they know that their "Tavarashi" are unprincipled and scheming opportunists also; they are ambitious for and crave power, with its authority; they talk "elimination of all classes" and, having risen from the gutter to become aristocrats of the realm, they aspire to become, figuratively speaking, knights and barons, counts, earls, dukes and princes. A proletarian in power is not as humane in his relations to subordinates as in so-called capitalistic countries; it is true that subservience is not so much in evidence, but an unreasonable brutality of authoritative power is in subtle operation, and the personal relationship of men in the various organizations is neither fraternal nor particularly pleasant. As a class, the proletariat are petted and pampered; as individuals, they are all enslaved and seek to rivet fetters on each other.

The Communist and the proletarians address each other as "comrade," but this has no real significance. Like "citizen" during the French Revolution, and "brother" in social lodges or religious assemblies, the term carries with it the mere acknowledgment of "belonging" to the same order or institution. As used by the Russians, the word *comrade* carries with it no affection, no peculiar measure of good will, and no particularly kindly feeling.

Russia is permeated to-day with jealousies and distrust in her inner working circles. Throughout

the land are the Vydvizhentsy—the workers who have been “pushed up” by the Communist Party into executive positions,—most of them ignorant, crude and incompetent, but also bigoted, suspicious and fearful. Not only has avarice for power and position supplanted, to a great degree, avarice for money and its equivalent, but the communist is driven and watched, used and abused; and if he gives others no human happiness, he receives but little, or none, himself. Russia is a prison, operated under relentless discipline, but the proletarian communists that are being “elevated” or “pushed up” are operating the treadmill.

Lenin wrote, “The Communist Party can accomplish its task only on condition that it is highly centralized, that it is dominated by an iron discipline which is quasi-military in its severity,” and he further affirmed, “Freedom is a bourgeois prejudice,” and, again, “Liberty is a mere bourgeois dream; therefore all talk of ‘equal rights’ is bourgeois nonsense.” Lenin, in addressing a delegation of Spanish Socialists, said, “We (Communists) never speak of liberty. We practise it in the name of the minority, the dictatorship of the proletariat, because the peasant classes have not yet become proletarian and are not with us.” Lenin frequently emphasized his belief that the end justified any and all means. His social creed was in absolute harmony with the militaristic tenets of Prussian imperialistic junkers and Chauvinists. “Moral? Only that is moral which aids the Communist Revolutionary Party” (then a mere handful of desperate, fanatical and intolerant men in a nation of some one hundred and sixty million souls). “All else is

bourgeois nonsense." Lenin further elaborated his moral views by saying, "Lies, deceits and treacheries to the bourgeoisie, to capitalists and to their government—all are justified in the sacred cause of the Communist revolution," and Stalin, his successor to the Russian Soviet and International Communist dictatorship, in a wireless to cutthroat Chinese Reds, more recently said, "We Communists recognize no ethics that shall control the actions of the revolutionary body."

In speaking of a treaty under discussion and consideration in February, 1919, the Russian Communist, Zinovieff, said, "We are willing to sign an unfavorable peace, . . . and put no trust in the paper, if we can use the breathing space so obtained to carry on for a space." This reminds one of the unscrupulous and warped mental attitude of the German militaristic junkers when they invaded and ravaged Belgium at the commencement of the World War and ignored the substance, or even the existence, of "a mere scrap of paper." Menjinsky is reported much more recently to have still further elucidated the operation and manifestation of communist morals—in reverse—by saying, "As long as there are idiots to take our signature seriously and to put their trust in it, we must promise everything that is being asked, and as much as one likes, if we can only get something tangible in exchange."

In the *Izvestia*, Joffe wrote, "To deceive your class enemies, to violate, to destroy a treaty imposed by force . . . are the true revolutionary methods of the true revolutionary struggle"—and force, as far as a Communist is concerned, may mean merely "force of circumstances." If a Communist, to ob-

tain benefits for the moment, agrees to a proposition that he does not like, then the arrangement he makes is deemed merely temporary and provisional, no matter what the words of an agreement may say; and the "terms," he argues, have been imposed upon him by "force." Any democrat or capitalist dealing, trading, covenanting, or entering into any economic, diplomatic, or political understanding with the Communists, will find that when it is to the interest of the Soviet Union to do so, the "word" will be denied, the treaty considered "a mere scrap of paper," obligations (financial and moral) will be repudiated—and the Communist will sardonically boast of his twentieth-century Eurasian-proletarian morals and ridicule the old-fashioned code of the democrat and capitalist and the gullibility of simple bourgeoisie. The Moscow dictatorship will make any declaration, sign any agreement, and enter into any treaty that, for the time being, will operate to its advantage—and this with an immoral and cynical determination, publicly admitted, to live up to such "obligations" and terms of agreement only so long as they serve the selfish purposes of Communism and its proclaimed objective of world-wide revolution. It has been well said, "To accept the signature of Soviet Russia to any pact in the face of the declarations of Soviet leaders, confirmed by the acts of the Soviet government, that such pacts are signed only as a meaningless gesture would be for Western statesmanship to convict itself of senility."

W. H. Chamberlain, with a Russian-born wife and collaborator, after seven years in Russia as a journalist acceptable to and obtaining his material

primarily from the Soviet dictatorship, with its drastic censorship—unequaled in history,—writes in "Soviet Russia" (1930), "Certainly the things which the average Western European or American associates with the phrase 'civil liberties'—freedom of speech and press for all citizens, freedom of political organization, guaranties against arbitrary search and arrest,—are completely non-existent in Russia to-day." He further states, "Not only is there no opposition press in Russia, but every newspaper or periodical dealing with political questions is under Communist control and voices, in news and editorials alike, only the orthodox Communist viewpoint. There are no privately-owned newspapers in Russia," and, again, "The writ of habeas corpus does not run in Russia. Any one suspected of a political or economic offense may be arrested, held in prison for an indefinite period, and finally exiled, sentenced to a term of imprisonment, or even executed, simply by the fiat of the all-powerful political police." We are further informed that the free use which the G. P. U. (secret police of the State Political Administration) makes of its sweeping powers of arrest results in the number of persons who are arrested and punished for political offenses in the Soviet Union being "one of the highest in the world."

The right of the G. P. U. to function in the triple rôle of policeman, judge and executioner is clearly brought out in the Russian Premier Rykov's reply to the protest of some British Labor Party leaders against the prompt execution of some twenty alleged counter-revolutionists in the spring of 1927, in which this Soviet official said, "The sentence of

the G. P. U. is characterized in your telegram as 'executions without legal trial.' This is not the case. According to the law of our State the collegium of the G. P. U. is competent in all cases when it is necessary to take energetic action against the counter-revolution; in these cases it has all the rights of a revolutionary tribunal." Mr. Chamberlain admits that "the vast majority of political arrests are never reported in the press." George Seldes says that Peters, head of the Red Terror in Petrograd, made the statement to him (recorded December 9, 1922): "We have executed some twenty or thirty thousand persons, perhaps fifty thousand. They were all spies, traitors, enemies within our ranks, a very small number in proportion to the persons of this kind in Russia." Mr. Seldes further states, as a result of his inquiries in Russia, "The victims of the Cheka are estimated anywhere from 50,000 to 500,000, with the truth probably midway. But it is not a matter of numbers. The outstanding fact to-day is that, by their tortures, wholesale arrests and wholesale murders of liberals suspected of not favoring the Bolshevik interpretation of Communism, the Cheka has terrorized a whole generation, the people of our time." Some two or three years ago, a claimed authoritative investigator sent a dispatch from Riga, published in the *London Times*, stating that the Cheka had actually executed 1,700,000 persons up to that time.

Martov, at the Seventh Congress of Soviets in 1919, declared that the Cheka "had become an omnipotent authority of the organs of oppression and police administration," and he added that the government had been forced to completely surrender

to the Cheka, "placing at its will, the life, liberty and honor of the citizens; the monstrous growth of terror, the elimination of everything which resembled courts, and an uncontrolled rule of anarchy are the results of this policy."

Kameneff, addressing the Russian political militia, said, "Not a single measure of the Soviet Government could have been put through without the help of the Cheka. It is the best example of Communist discipline." The revolutionary Cheka (Chesvychaika) and its predominant surviving section or lineal successor, the G. P. U., is the instrument of militant communism and the Red Terror, organized in 1918, through which Russia's Indivisible Trinity—the Soviet Government, the Communist Party and the Third International—maintains itself in dictatorial power.

The Communist Cheka was organized, following the lines of the Czarist Okhrana. A large number of the men enrolled in this service are well-paid expert spies, sleuths and thugs, who do not care for whom they work; they are not necessarily Communists, or even men entirely sympathetic to the Communist theory of life; but they are, and have to be, loyal and competent paid servants of the Communist dictator; many of the men are said to be old Czarist spies and secret police, hiring out professionally with a new master and hunting out aristocrats as heretics to-day, and in so doing capitalizing the experience gained in hunting, persecuting and torturing the proletarian-championing intelligentsia, labor organizers and revolutionists in the old days of the Empire.

The departments of the Cheka, as originally

organized and generally continued, consist of the armed uniformed militia, the *Sekretnaya Operative Odyel* for prison work, and the Administrative (Third) section of the Soviet Espionage and Counter-Espionage department. One Commissariat controls the work, and it is said of Dzerdzinsky, the old Chief who died of heart trouble in 1926 after delivering a vehement attack on Trotskyism, that if he had any notion of a communist hereafter his only death-bed mental perplexity, like that of Philip II of Spain, would be wonder and doubt as to whether he had tortured and killed enough heretics, as a "defender of the faith," to insure his safe entrance into Paradise.

Stalin, in the course of an interview granted to an American labor delegation, said, "The revolution needs the G. P. U., and the G. P. U. will live with us to the terror of the enemies of the proletariat." The Cheka (G. P. U.) has been and is an admitted great success. Years have brought a change in name, with somewhat less surface evidence of its devilish operations, but with even more secrecy and subtlety. George Seldes, from keen observation, says, "The Terror is in the mind and marrow of the present generation, and nothing but generations of freedom and liberty will ever root it out," and, again, "Because of the Cheka, freedom has ceased to exist in Russia. There is no democracy. It is not wanted. Only American apologists for the Soviets have ever pretended there was democracy in Russia. Justice in Russia is Communist 'justice'; the end justifies the means, and the end is Communism at all costs, including the lives of its opponents. Freedom, liberty, jus-

tice, democracy, all the fundamental human rights for which the world has been fighting for civilized centuries, have been abolished in Russia in order that the Communist experiment might be made."

Stalin describes the Cheka and G. P. U. as "the punitive organ of the Soviet power, resembling the Comité de Salut Publique of the French Revolution. It represents something like a military-political tribunal, constituted to protect the revolution against the assaults of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and its agents." Sherwood Eddy, in "The Challenge of Russia" (1931), says that the G. P. U. is "still probably the most powerful and dreaded police organization in the world"; they have their own armed force, uniformed and plain clothes, their own secret courts and prisons, and in their courts a prisoner is not allowed counsel and cannot call witnesses in his own defense. The G. P. U. is not an agency of justice, but an instrument of terror, class prejudice and class protection. A victim does not have to be proved guilty; if any doubt exists, he is condemned. "It is better for a hundred innocent to suffer than for one guilty person to go free."

George S. Counts, referring to the G. P. U., says, "Since it works secretly and since it may combine judicial with police functions, its actions are so shrouded in mystery and so clothed with finality that its very name has come to strike terror in the hearts of persons opposed to Bolshevik rule." The Communists call the G. P. U. "the unsheathed sword of the proletariat," and Dr. Counts admits that "without it the dictatorship would most certainly have collapsed long ago."

Blood and terror founded, and now maintain, the Russian Communist Utopia. General Haskell (who served as Chief of the American Relief Association in Russia from 1921 to 1923), after a recent visit to Russia, says, "The Terror is omnipresent and has changed little, if any, during the last few years. . . . By it the government discourages opposition to its programs, stifles incipient counter-revolution and prevents sabotage. It keeps unsympathetic workmen from dropping wrenches into machinery, engineers from faulty designing, and farmers from resisting collectivization. . . . No one is able to tell who is a spy or informer to-day any more easily than he could at any time during the last ten years. . . . The strength of the Red Army has been variously estimated at between 700,000 and 1,000,000 men. It looks more effective than it did five years ago. On its loyalty and that of the G. P. U. (secret police) depends the continuance of the dictatorship, and the leaders know it better than any one else. . . . It must be borne in mind that this dictatorship, like all others, rests on military force. If the army decides some day to revolt (which is most unlikely), the present régime would not last more than twenty-four hours."

In these days when agitation is being made by several of our industrialists, bankers and well-meaning, but gullible, intelligentsia to have the United States formally recognize the Soviet Union, it is well to note that the establishment in this country of a Russian Soviet representative and his staff means the introduction into this country, not only of revolutionary agitators, communist organizers and trouble-makers (for many of them are here now

and are coming in regularly), but of the dreaded secret G. P. U. European and other foreign capitals could tell many stories, if they were so minded, of the lawless operations of these sleuths, who respect neither life nor property, morals nor principles. The United States can well afford to refuse Russian export as well as import business and the entry into the United States of any and all Communists, with their paid agents and sleuths.

Some few years ago, W. H. Chamberlain tells us, "an American came to Moscow for the purpose of studying the state of civil liberty under the Soviets. This evoked an outburst of uncontrolled amusement from a Russian acquaintance, a former social democrat, who had suffered the not uncommon fate of being a political prisoner, both under the Czarist régime and under the Soviet Government. 'Civil liberty in the Soviet Union,' he laughed. 'Soon some historian will begin to investigate the status of civil liberty under Ivan the Terrible. He will find just as much there as here.' " This is an understatement of fact; he would have found more liberty, more general human justice, and less murderous intolerance under any old and cruel Russian despotism than has existed in Soviet Russia during recent years or is in evidence to-day.

Ivan IV (1530-1584), Czar of Muscovy, had a neurotic strain in his character. He grew up in "a brutal and degrading environment where he learned to hold human life and human dignity in contempt." Ivan entertained an exalted idea of his own "divine" right and authority, and he became known as "The Terrible" because of the countless executions, tortures and cruelties asso-

ciated with his reign. There is much in modern Russian so-called Communism that reminds one of Ivan the Terrible's class prejudices, stupid egoism and merciless inhumanity. He conceived an extinguishable hatred for the boyars (the Russian aristocracy) and a corresponding friendship for the middle and lower classes, merchants, artisans and agriculturists. He wanted only men to assist him in strengthening and developing the kingdom "who could look steadily forward to the future because they had no past to look back upon; men who would unflinchingly obey their Sovereign because they owed their whole political significance to him alone." Ivan IV, like Peter I after him and Stalin the Communist dictator of to-day, "clearly recognized the necessity of raising Muscovy (ancient Russia) to the level of her neighbors by promoting a wholesale immigration of master workmen and skilled artificers." It is significant that the King of Poland, as a protective measure, threatened with death all those who were found guilty of assisting the Russians with either armaments or the knowledge and skill in producing them. He decreed: "The Muscovite, who is not only our opponent to-day, but the eternal enemy of all free nations, should not be allowed to supply himself with cannons, bullets and munitions, or with artisans who manufacture arms hitherto unknown to those barbarians."

Ivan had queer theories and queer plans, his "centuria" decrees improved conditions for a time, but "that which at first seemed good did not hold, and evil was ever in the ascendancy." In 1565, Ivan declared in disgust his intention to abdicate the

throne, but "the common people whom he had always unduly and unwarrantedly favored" at the expense of the upper classes "implored him to keep his throne on any terms." This he consented to do, and entrenched himself in power within a peculiar institution, the Oprichniki or Separate Estate, which, in fact, was a large body of retainers—beyond all law, except that of the ruling despot (a combined Red Army and Cheka)—who roved over the country, killing and plundering "suspects" of breeding or wealth, and reducing all nobles to the lowliest serfdom—dependent, in life and property, upon the autocrat's slightest whim. How did Ivan the Terrible's dictatorship work with an elevated low-class aristocracy of special rights and privileges? History tells us that "terrible and horrible things happened in the realm" and Ivan became "infuriated against God and man." In 1569, he ruthlessly destroyed Great Novgorod, the second city of the land and famed in the Hanseatic League for its traditional liberties, for claimed conspiracy—"without a hearing, without a trial, without proof." He and his horde "ravaged the land like a wild beast" and enjoyed five weeks of systematic and deliberate massacres—a slaughtering of the innocents and an extermination of those whom he feared, of whom he was suspicious or who, he thought, differed with him. This inhuman Russian dictator, when fifty years of age, struck and killed his eldest surviving son in an ungovernable fury because the young man had dared to differ with him. Ivan IV's experiment to elevate the proletarians in order to strengthen himself as dictator against the aristocracy of the realm was not a suc-

cess: it did not lead to prosperity or to peace, to happiness or to progress. History is repeating itself.

Ivan's attempt to lift the lowly, and not only depress but enslave the upper classes, was followed by black days of horror in the history of Russia and a period of anarchical, political and social convulsions and revolutions, known to Russian history as "The Troubled Times"; and after a generation of anarchy, with serf uprisings, barbarous reprisals by the boyars, ravages by the pretender or his allies, and Cossack plundering raids, the chains of serfdom became more firmly riveted on the Russian peasant. Will history continue to repeat itself?

There is absolutely no academic freedom in Russia to-day. W. H. Chamberlain admits it and says, "Any professor who lets drop any unguarded word critical of the existing régime, or who holds in history or economics, philosophy or science non-Marxian, or idealistic, views at variance with the prevalent dogma of materialism, is likely to be dismissed," which means no standing as a citizen or as a human being, no food tickets, no shelter, and, unless kept alive by charity, inevitable death from hunger and exposure. Dismissal is a subtle word in Russia; it has grown to mean "death," with Nature as the Soviets' executioner.

Mr. Chamberlain seeks to excuse the Russian Communist attitude toward civil liberty by saying that "one should bear in mind the fact that Russia lay almost entirely outside the influence of three movements which probably contributed more to implant the ideal of respect for individual consciousness, thought and judgment in the Western mind,

namely, the Renaissance, the Reformation and the French Revolution," and, he adds, "A Westerner, unless he be a Communist of the most stalwart brand of faith, will never feel quite at home under a proletarian dictatorship." Mr. Chamberlain, presumably American-born and an American citizen, apparently minimizes the world importance and practical working sanity of the American Revolution. He admits that liberty and democracy would operate "to reduce the consciousness of repression" with which Russians of to-day are both cursed and handicapped, and he questions whether the gradual making over of the people by coercion and force into "the Communist and Soviet mold" will be the final glowering and ultimate good, "or will it be simply an amazing triumph of regimentation of the ideas and habits of a large, passive majority by a small, active minority?"

The Russian philosopher, Soloviev, described his countrymen as a "God-seeking people," but the Communist Party of Soviet Russia has declared that atheism shall be the State creed in the "Holy Russia" of the despotic czars. The so-called "philosophic basis" of Marx-Lenin Communism is a materialism which is absolutely atheistic and strongly hostile to all religion. Marx said, "Religion is the opium of the people," and this thought is the corner-stone of the whole "philosophy" of Russian Communism to-day in the realm of religion. Lenin wrote, "We must combat religion. . . . The fight must be directed toward eradicating the social roots of religion," and, again, "Religion is one of the forms of spiritual oppression, lying everywhere on the masses of the people. . . . To him who works and

is poor all his life, religion teaches passivity and patience in earthly life, consoling him with the hope of a heavenly reward. . . . Religion is opium for the people.” Lenin further said, “Religion must be abolished. The best country is a godless country. If religion will pass out quietly, our attitude will be one of benevolent tolerance. But if it resists, we will hasten its exit by violence proportioned to its resistance.”

Sovietism disfranchises the priests, rabbis and ministers of all religions, and religious instruction of any nature and of any creed or belief is arbitrarily tabued by the State. The Soviet authorities in Moscow frankly state that “religion is inevitably and absolutely hostile to the Soviet Government; the two systems are in necessary conflict and antagonism. The capitalistic nations and their leaders stand for class peace, we for class war. Christian principles blunt the edge of this class war. We regard religion as gross and vicious superstition, and in our educational system seek to remove from the minds of children and youth all vestiges of such superstition. Every Communist must be an atheist; he can be nothing else. Capitalistic peoples say, ‘We let the people choose for themselves what they will or will not believe.’ We Communists say: ‘People do not believe what they will, but what they are told. And we propose to tell them.’” The Russians will not tolerate any competition in their propaganda-impregnated educational system. If any priest, minister, or advocate of any religion or social system is found to be reaching, or is even “suspected” of influencing, youth, labor, soldiers, or any of the dynamic classes, he is silenced at once and

exiled. The secret police deal with such a person so quietly and so effectively that the man's friends, neighbors, or followers never know what has happened to him.

Stalin, in an interview with the American Labor Delegation (Sept. 15, 1927), thus stated his position on religion: "The Party cannot be neutral in regard to religion. Communists who hinder the broadest development of anti-religious propaganda have no place in the ranks of the Party."

The Communists have organized the Militant Godless Society, whose purpose, according to its Constitution, is: "Active, systematic and continuous struggle against religion in all its forms and appearances." Special "anti-religious" universities have been founded in thirteen centers of population "to prepare leaders for an atheistic missionary campaign." Anti-religious papers, magazines and books are printed (some with government financial support) and *The Godless*, a weekly journal, claims a circulation of some 400,000. The Leningrad *Krasnaya Gazeta* (April 19, 1930) gives the membership of the Militant Godless Society as two and a half million; the Society states that their membership, which was 98,402 in 1927, was 700,000 in 1929 (with 12,000 branches) and 3,000,000 in 1930—which number they expect to increase fourfold as the result of an anti-religious Five-Year Plan. The Militant Godless Society operates with (1) propagandized atheism, which is a kind of fanatical religion itself, and (2) burlesque and ridicule; it has made over a score of anti-religious moving pictures and has a large organization of speakers, lecturers and missionaries. They seek, by propaganda, to kill

religion and make Russia atheistic in fact. Russia, reeking with injustice, afire with brutal passion, worshiping cruel force and terrorism, smelling of blood, and vibrating with the anguish of the oppressed and curses of the barbarian dictators; Russia, whose great aim and ideal is to be 100 per cent. godless, is the proletarian Zion. Trotzky, in his eloquent orations, has frequently urged his audience to go out and fight for a real heaven, saying that the only paradise in this or any other world would come with the final victory of the revolution.

Russian Communists recently stated that their plan had been, and still is, "to make the Soviet Union godless and churchless by the close of 1934." Churches are steadily being closed, demolished, and secularized. Since the establishment of the Bolshevik Soviet system in Russia, a continuous and unrelenting attack has been and now is being carried on against God, religion, and morality. The official Code issued by the Commissar of Public Instruction (prepared by Stepanoff) says, "We must act so that each blow aimed at the traditional structure of the Church, each blow aimed at the clergy, shall attack religion in general. . . . Nothing would be gained if the disorganization of orthodoxy profited the sectarians (or Protestant Evangelicals). We must glide from orthodoxy directly into atheism. . . . The blindest can see how indispensable it becomes to fight decisively against the pope, whether he be called pastor, abbé, rabbi, patriarch, mullah, or pope; this fight must develop no less inevitably 'against God,' whether He be called Jehovah, Jesus, Buddha or Allah."

Church bells are strangely silent in Russia. They

have been moved from many of the churches and sent to foundries for recasting into "useful things" to further the great Five-Year Industrial and Military Plan. The campaign against the churches for a while (conjointly with that aimed at the Kulaks and Nepmen—all of the same species of despised "heretics") went to such lengths and excesses that Stalin, in a message suggesting some degree of moderation and the taking of more time to obtain "the desired and worthy objective," ironically attacks those ardent, but unbridled, enthusiasts who introduce collectivization "with the tearing down of church bells."

George Seldes, in "Can These Things Be," says that it was to test the religious fervor of the people, or perhaps to enrage the devout, that the authorities in Soviet Russia destroyed the Shrine of the Iberian Virgin, the little blue, red, and gold building, most sacred in Russia, at the entrance of the Red Square. But nothing happened. Authoritative Communist propaganda, coupled with terrorism, proved too strong for a people to fight. It is the young people and children of Russia who are openly deriding religion; the older people are horrified and shocked, but too intimidated, apprehensive and subdued to openly protest and rebel. Communism, with atheism, is the religion of the League of Communist Youth and of the children's organizations of Soviet Russia, and boys and girls greatly augment, in numbers and in bigoted, but thoughtless, enthusiasm, the League of the Godless and parade the streets "with lewd and satanic banners, burning crucifixes and images they make or steal from the churches and

edifices of Jehovah, Moses, Christ, Buddha, Mohammed."

Lunarcharsky, the former Commissar of Education, in ardent national and international communist propaganda on the subject "Why we should not believe in God," said, "We hate Christianity and Christians. Even the best of them must be regarded as our worst enemies. They preach love of one's neighbors and pity, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is a hindrance to the development of the revolution. Down with the love of one's neighbors. What we want is hatred. We must know how to hate, for only at this price can we conquer the universe. We have done with the Kings of the Earth. Let us deal now with the King of the Skies. The anti-religious campaign must not be restricted to Russia; it should be carried on throughout the world."

Lunarcharsky warned teachers who still persisted in being "religious"—and he estimated their number as some one-third or four-tenths of the entire teaching staff—as follows: "The believing teacher in the Soviet school is an awkward contradiction, and departments of popular education are bound to use every opportunity to replace such teachers with new ones of anti-religious sentiments." In other words, either come out openly for atheism or lose your jobs, be disfranchised and become "deprived" and outlawed pariahs. In a speech before the Fourteenth All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Lunarcharsky further said, "All our cultural institutions ; . . must be considered by us as working on the front for the repulse of the religious danger. . . . I should like, in the most sadistic manner, to root out

and tear out somehow this weed from our fields and gardens.”

In *Pravda* (official organ “Truth”)—March 29, 1929,—we read from the Commissar of Education’s pen that “theatres, concerts, moving pictures, radio, visits to museums, richly-illustrated, scientific and especially anti-religious lectures, well-arranged periodicals and non-periodical children’s literature—all this must be set in motion, developed, completed, or created for the great objective of most quickly transforming the growing generation into an absolutely atheistic one.”

Michel Bukharin, whose consuming passion, when preaching the savage creed of the Marx-Communist class struggle, was atheism and hate, said, “Let your own happiness be your own law. Tear out of your heart the belief in the existence of God. Until this is done you will never know what freedom is. You must accustom yourself to destroy everything, the so-called good with the bad. For if an atom of the old world remains, the new one will never be created. Take heed that no ark be allowed to rescue any atom of this old world which we consecrate to destruction.” Bukharin, in “A B C of Communism,” further states, “Religion and Communism are incompatible, both theoretically and practically. . . . The Christian Code runs: ‘Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.’ In most cases there is an irreconcilable conflict between the principles of Communist tactics and the Commandments of religion.”

The original Soviet Constitution granted equal freedom for religious or anti-religious propaganda. The result was that there was a quite pronounced

growth in religious feeling among certain bodies of peasants, workers, and even youth; so much so that the Communists became alarmed, and, in 1928, became positively and officially anti-religious, this attitude leading to a change in the Constitution adopted by the Congress of Soviets in May, 1929.

In the Diplomatic Year Book of the Soviet Union, 1929, Jaroslansky-Goubelmann (member of the Direction of the Commissariat of Inspection) says, "Communism and religion are hostile, the one to the other, and cannot be placed side by side. When religion is victorious, communism is weak. The Communist régime will only be realized in a society freed of religion," and, again, "We have founded our Union (U. S. S. R.) precisely for the fight against all religious cramming of the heads of the workers."

Sherwood Eddy (a four-times visitor to Russia in the last seven years), in "The Challenge of Russia" (1931), says, "It is one of the strange anomalies of Russian life that under a class dictatorship opposed by hostile nations there exists a fear psychosis and a consequent suspicion of or contempt for other classes, so that life is lived by individuals or communities largely in separate, water-tight compartments," and he adds that Russia is the only country in the world where three or four Christian students cannot meet in secret or in public to discuss religion, or where a university student cannot openly profess his religious faith and remain unmolested. "To my knowledge some Christian students have been imprisoned or banished on account of their religious beliefs, some are in exile, some have been expelled from the universities, while more

are silenced, living their lonely lives in secret." Mr. Eddy also tells us that Christians in Russia have begged him and his friends not to call upon them when they visit the Soviet Union. "To-day we dare not meet them. Most Russians of the old intellectual or religious classes are now afraid to have any contact whatever with foreigners, for obvious reasons."

The Russian arbitrary, bigoted and unscrupulous dictatorship in power has not only decreed that "all gods are false" and "there is no God," but "there shall be no God in Russia or for Communists anywhere." Having made this momentous decision with the propagation of many inflexible substantiating declarations, the Russian Soviet Communists most inconsistently declare and act to make the Bolshevik dictatorship in Russia the one and only absolute god of all the Russian people.

Lenin, or, rather, an artificial picture and unreal memory of the man, is generally revered by many of the peasants and proletariat of Russia to-day, and he is capitalized by the Communist dictatorship to the limit of their resourcefulness. His embalmed body, in a glass casket, visible to "the faithful," is on exhibition in Moscow, and the whole land abounds with Lenin myths. In many homes a one-time revered ikon has been displaced by a picture of Lenin; in other homes the ikon is in one corner and a picture or bust of Lenin in another, which suggests a divided allegiance, either in the home or in the heart of the same person or persons. One picture of Lenin, showing him in a characteristic pose, issued by the Association of Revolutionary Artists in 1928, we are told, "sold fifteen million copies during the first year." Lenin's apparent

greatness was primarily due to his absolute unwavering and fanatical devotion to a set of theoretical principles or theories, and to an extraordinary flexibility in choosing workable means and the time for attempting to realize these principles or theories. Lenin was not only a revolutionary zealot, but a practical, hard-headed schemer and a brilliant strategist, as well as a ruthless destroyer in the battles against not only the despotism of aristocracies and plutocracies, but—with equal fervor and inhumanity—against democracy, and even against any and all forms of socialism and communism other than his own interpretation of a ruthless Marxian brand.

The Communist Party is more of a closed order of fanatical believers than any other political, social, or religious body that has impressed itself upon any part of mankind in the history of the world. Sherwood Eddy says that there is "a close parallel between the Constitution of the Communists and the Jesuits. . . . Both organizations seem to believe that the end justifies the means and that the individual matters little compared to . . . the elect class . . . that is to them significant. . . . Both are flamingly intolerant; both dogmatic," and, again, he says that Marx-Lenin Communism has become a sort of "materialistic religion" to an "embittered and aroused" class, taking the place of "the solace of an other-worldly religion which Marx maintained had become the drug or soporific opiate of the people," and, he adds, "Of this new substitute for the old religion, the writings of Marx became, as it were, the Old Testament, the thirty volumes of Lenin became the canonical New Testament,

now in process of translation into thirty-five languages by the Third International, while Stalin is now writing in deeds, rather than in words, the orthodox epistles of the new faith."

As Beecher said, Christianity has not been tried and found wanting; it has not been tried. Real social democracy, with its individual liberty, majority rule and private property (capitalism), is not a failure, for it also has not been tried—no matter what our patriotic or campaign orators, our demagogues or our radical intelligentsia may say. Neither Christianity nor Democracy has been given an honest trial or even a fair chance in our world of selfish, prejudiced and essentially ignorant people. No people in the world are free; and loud-boasting Americans to-day actually enjoy less liberty than we enjoyed a few decades ago and less than the peoples of certain other more democratic lands. Tyranny is no test of truth and no measure of faith; and this is a fact applicable to every phase of life and to every channel of government and human restraint.

In the United States the machinery exists, and is in evidence, by and through which the people may enforce their will by due process of law. Americans are directly to blame, individually and as a people, for any and all restrictions of their "divine right" and inalienable liberty. Our Constitution not only permits, but encourages us to be truly free and democratic—if we will it so. Conditions in Russia are at the opposite pole; there, no man can be free, and no man has any "rights," any voice, any standing as an individual, or any hope. The Russian people have no choice between liberty and tyranny;

they are fettered, enslaved and oppressed. The Communists hold a monopoly of propaganda, direction of education and governing power, and can only maintain themselves in power by ruthless force that permits of no freedom of thought, no religious or other influence, and no competition in any phase of life, of thought, or of any nature whatsoever. With the support of democratic-Christian and capitalistic nations, the Russian atheistic and Communist Soviet Union may carry through, in a large measure, its grandiose Five-Year Plan, but no people under the subjection of slavery, physical and mental, with religious oppression, dominated and controlled by cruel, inhuman force and terrorism, will lead the world for any length of time—if at all. Progress to a higher plane will come only as force is removed and the mind and soul, as well as the body, of man is free to soar.

Krupskaya (Madam Lenin) has been much interested in the child problem in Russia, where the poor waifs, as outcasts, wandered around the country in droves, with habits and a lawless mode of life resembling wild animals. Writing for the official *Pravda* a few years ago, she said, "We have 7,000,000 deserted children officially registered, and 80,000 who have been gathered into our asylums. How many more are wandering about Russia?" During the past year or two this distressing wild nomad child-life must have been put under some degree of control, although young and nameless, wild and irresponsible children are still frequently encountered in distressingly large numbers and are said to exist in hordes, as animals, in out-of-the-way places. In the cities, many children and groups of

children have been captured and their apache, lawless life terminated as they are placed in institutions or put to work under strict discipline. Who are these millions of homeless young waifs, the very existence of which—fourteen years after the Revolution—is of itself enough to damn irretrievably the Communist Party and their social system? They are the children of the disfranchised, the deprived, the declassed, the exiled, the “liquidated,” the exterminated, the imprisoned, and the murdered. They are the children without known fathers or mothers, the product of communist laxity and easy divorce laws. They are the fruits of serf labor and outrageous living conditions, of easy morals and the denial of God. Yet Madam Lenin, so interested in the training and development of children to make them worthy and useful, is a bigoted anti-religionist and says, “It is necessary, more and more, to inject a materialistic spirit into education, to energetically work with organizations of children to develop in them the spirit of (communist) comradeship, to eradicate more fully the very roots of religion.”

Henry Wales, writing from Vladivostok in July, 1931, after having completed a trip of some twelve thousand miles in the Soviet Union, says, “Through the Southern districts I saw the herds of tramps, bums and child waifs, homeless men, and boys, thousands of them only 11 and 12 years old, and a few girls, on their annual migration from the warmth of the South to the larger communities in the North now that the rigors of winter have passed. Barefooted, ragged, black and filthy, with long, matted hair covered with vermin, polluting the at-

mosphere with the stench of their unwashed bodies, drawn, haggard, gaunt and famishing, these monsters walked the streets of the towns, fighting with the dogs in the streets and the ominous clumsy crows for a morsel of carrion thrown away, or sat day after day and night after night in the railway stations, furtively waiting for an opportunity to rifle the pockets of a drunken peasant or steal the luggage of an unwary passenger, or stow away quickly in a train."

The youth of Russia are the hope of the Communist Party. The League of Communist Youth reported (Sept., 1928) to the Fifth World Congress International that it had 2,030,000 members. Sherwood Eddy, in "The Challenge of Russia," gives the membership of the Komsomols at 2,466,000 and of the Pioneers and Octobrists at 3,301,458. It is said that in the fall of 1930 the membership had grown to 3,000,000; that the Pioneers of Young Children had 4,000,000 members, and that two bodies of still younger children were organized and doing effective work in the making of enthusiastic, well-taught, well-disciplined and obedient young Communists. Seldes said that 2,500,000 Russian youths are enlisted in the Komsomols, with 4,000,000 more prospects coming up, and that the aim of the Soviet Union is to produce ten million new and fervid young Communists by intensive training, hothouse-grown, propaganda-fed and protected from all harmful reading that might produce the wrong kind of thought—for Communism.

The Young Russian Pioneers (a sort of Communist Boy Scout organization of children 10 to 16 years of age) are being taught, young, to be inter-

nationally-minded. The Red Flag is a world-wide flag of revolution and communism, but the Pioneers have five laws, five customs and five logs at their camp-fire—the five in each case symbolizing the five continents and five races of the world, the workers of which, in one proletarian class, will arise, unite and make over the entire world. The Children's Pioneer badge reads: "For the struggle in the cause of the workers, be ready." At a recent convention of Pioneers held in Moscow, with some fifty thousand in attendance, there were several delegates from the United States present, both black and white.

An illustration (1) of how Russia guides and controls the childish mind and (2) how the propaganda mill of the Soviet Union and of Communism works, is presented in the form of a letter written by the Morton children of English birth, resident in Leningrad (father died after two years in Russia), to Viscountess Astor, made public in Moscow and broadcast from there the world over. After telling how well they like Soviet Russia, their studies, and "exciting future as Communists," the children, functioning as well-disciplined and obedient little soldier-slaves, say: "Tell all about this to your friends. Speak at public meetings and tell about the Soviet Union, about what we and our mother have written you. Write more in the papers about the Soviet Union. . . . We, former foreigners, will never leave the fatherland of labor for any capitalistic country. And we will not go merely because our mother won't. . . . Tell about this to our friends, all the workers of England. Tell them that the workers and their children should act as we did,

because the working class has only one fatherland—the country in which we are now living.”

The children of Russia are being trained as standardized communist-bred robots, which will play standardized communist graphophone records of their master's voice: World revolution; Down with all bourgeoisie; Workers of the world unite; Religion is the opium of the people, etc. “The Youth Movement,” said Lenin, “is the best part of the Third International,” and Trotzky said, “The education of the young is, for us, a question of life and death,” and by education is meant a process of being filled to overflowing with “inspired” biased and brain-b numbing propaganda. It has been said that “to teach children super-patriotism is difficult; it is easier to teach them to hate.” George Seldes said, “Hatred in dictatorial countries has been set up as a religion in the process of the corruption of youth,” and he adds, “The only religion I have found among the godless young Communists (the League of Communist Youth) is the religion of destruction and hatred.”

Lenin, born (1870) in a sleepy little Volga town of Russian middle-class parents, was early drawn into underground revolutionary movements. From 1900 to 1917, he lived in England, Switzerland, and other foreign countries. With a prophetic sense that it has been said “is sometimes vouchsafed to the fanatical and denied to the man of reason and moderation,” Lenin, in 1914, immediately foresaw the possibility that the World War would lead to violent revolutionary upheavals, and in a Bolshevik manifesto, which he wrote on the outbreak of the war, we read, “To turn the contemporary imperial-

istic war into civil war, that is the sole correct proletarian solution."

Lenin did not believe in human liberty, democracy, or the free ballot. He affirmed that "Communism can never come by a process of peaceful evolution, even in countries where such democratic liberties as universal suffrage and freedom of press and assemblage prevail." Lenin did not want a large party as a ruling body; he preferred, for purposes of swift, decisive action, a small, fanatically-devoted and well-disciplined organization, distinguished by the two qualities of (1) absolute servile subordination to the will of the leaders, and (2) willingness of each member to embrace martyrdom joyfully—making any sacrifices, up to life itself, for the advancement of the cause (as outlined and set forth by Lenin). Large social bodies, it was stated, would have too many individual opinions and differences and would "prove flabby and irresolute in moments of crisis."

Toward the end of Lenin's life it became evident that Russia must be developed industrially and agriculturally if it were to survive, and in one of the last things that Lenin wrote—a pamphlet on "Cooperation," we read that the Soviet Union "has all the means for the establishment of a Socialist society." Because of the resistance of other peoples to the Russian brand of communism offered as a panacea for all human, political and economic ills, and as Russia was becoming increasingly poor, backward and internally demoralized economically, Lenin in his last years foresaw the absolute need of improving Russia's domestic conditions before his brand of communism could do effective revolution-

ary missionary work abroad. The "New Economic Policy" (or the N. E. P.) was formulated and made operative by Lenin, and although millions died of starvation (and other tens of millions were saved by the charitable operations of the American Relief Administration and, to a much less degree, by other kindred foreign organizations) the N.E.P. marked a turning-point in the history of the Russian Revolution and commenced an era of protection and consolidation—which the Five-Year Plan has materially and far more definitely continued—looking primarily toward the development of Russia's food, industrial and military resources before the fully contemplated and necessary, organized, aggressive moves are made abroad to further the object of Russian Communism and the Third International.

Trotsky, during recent years, has stood forth as the Russian champion of the international plan and aspect of Bolshevik Communism, and Stalin as the advocate, first, of national supremacy, with its successful, economic and militaristic development, with International Communism and World Revolution following in due order—when, and not until, the Russian dictatorship is ready and so decrees. In 1925, not only Trotsky, but Zinovieff and Kamenefff protested that Stalin's leadership was neglecting and even repudiating the Lenin policy of fostering the international revolutionary movement and was promoting, instead, a national so-called communist plan of state capitalization.

Just before his death, Lenin prepared a sort of political testament and predicted that the main danger of a Communist-Party split lay in the clash-

ing and different temperaments of Stalin and Trotsky, whom he characterized as "the two most gifted leaders of the present Central Committee." Lenin was a man of nerves; a foxy, keen opportunist and dissembler, with brains, subtlety, patience, fervid passion and hatred. Stalin, son of a cobbler, whose life has been lived among the working classes, is a cold and calculating man of steel, void of pity; whereas Trotsky is of the pseudointelligentsia and a fervid man of fire. Trotsky is at heart a great individualist—he must be "it" or nothing. He fought bitterly at times with Lenin, whom, in 1913, he called "that professional exploiter of every backwardness in the Russian Labor movement," and added, "The whole edifice of Leninism at the present time is based on lies and falsification and contains within itself the poisonous beginnings of its own disintegration." W. H. Chamberlain, in "Soviet Russia," says, "Lenin himself was no mealy-mouthed controversialist, and he more than once in pre-revolutionary days characterized Trotsky by epithets which were equally trenchant and uncomplimentary." Lenin and Trotsky worked together, hand and glove, during the Bolshevik revolutionary movements in Russia, and Lenin capitalized and used, with much success, Trotsky's fiery rebel temperament, his energy, his ruthlessness, and his administrative ability during what was primarily the destructive period of the Revolution; but Trotsky could not work in harness with Lenin's disciples, when Lenin the Master weakened and became virtually incapacitated through ill health and the more prosaic problems of economic reconstruction came to the fore.

Trotsky had nothing to do with the abdication of the Czar and he bitterly opposed all attempts to create a Social Democratic Government in Russia to supplant Czarism. After enjoying, during a turbulent period, the sanctuary and protection of the democratic Republic of the United States, in his farewell speech delivered in the Bronx, New York, March 28, 1917, prior to his departure for Europe he said, "I want you people to organize and keep on organizing in America in order that you may be able to overthrow this dirty, rotten Government of the United States. I am going back to Russia to overthrow the government there and stop this war with Germany." Here speaks one of the high priests of Russian economics—and, with Lenin, a destroyer of a civilization that they have been powerless to reconstruct. The sins of Lenin and Trotsky, and all of their ilk, were not those of circumstance; they were premeditated, studied and deliberate.

Trotsky became known to the Russian leaders as the man "of the biting word"; described as "mercurial and unstable, ambitious and ruthless"; a man who unhesitatingly wars with his colleagues to attain his personal ends and to put into effect his personal (and, at times, erratic, non-economic and unwise political, social and party) views. Moreover, as W. H. Chamberlain says, "not the least of the psychological factors in the downfall of Trotsky was the fact that he was a little too obviously above the mass of the Party officials in cultural background and literary capacity, and a little too self-conscious of this fact." There is nothing "cultural," in the sense of enlightenment, refinement, morality, or idealism, in Trotsky's make-up or background,

but he is an educated man of power, and he knows it. He is also an inhuman, bloodthirsty devil, and so good a general and strategist that an Elba would be better as his domicile to-day than Turkey. Trotzky became too "big" for the Communist Party and was in the way of Stalin, so he was "removed through administrative process." Trotzky, by sheer force of genius and personality, had welded together an ungainly anarchic army into a well-disciplined and victorious fighting force that had brought triumph, as the Red Army, to the Communist cause, but even he (Lenin's accepted prime partner in the Revolution) was thrown on "the scrap-heap" when he failed to toe the mark exactly as prescribed by Stalin, the dictator.

Trotsky has twitted Stalin for his lack of education and criticized him for his "coarse" brain and academic shortcomings, but the history of the Russian intelligentsia is a tragic one, and but a very few of the scholars and agitators that worked for the Revolution and suffered for their principles under Czarism have been absorbed and hold good standing in the Communist Party now in power. Stalin, "a man of the people," is more naturally acceptable to the communists as a leader than Trotsky of the intelligentsia. This feeling of class consciousness and class resentment, with a marked psychological trait of "boundless hatred for the past" and a sentiment of ruthless hostility for "the people who were," penetrates not only the ranks, but the inner circles of the Communist Party.

A communist—rabidly loyal to the cause, but "educated," and therefore of the intelligentsia, receiving a position which calls for considerable tech-

nical training and specialization, is apt to be attacked by some communist of proletarian origin demanding that the job be given to a manual "worker" of approved "orthodox" ancestry. An institution known as the Chistka, or "cleaning," has developed in Russia, and periodically the "leaders" of industry—the technical and administrative staffs—are required to face (and be annoyed and humiliated by) a "cleaning commission"—which is under the control of the Soviet Government, the Communist Party and the dictator. All interested are invited to attend and ask questions, and the man's private life is apt to be hauled out into the pitiless light of publicity—unless he is sound and branded orthodox, i.e., a proletarian of proletarians. Calvin B. Hoover says, "The ancestry of the victim is particularly examined into, and happy is he who can answer that his mother 'came from the wooden plow' and his father 'came from the loom,' and thrice damned is he whose ancestry includes either Kulak, bourgeois, or landlord."

Stalin, equally as irreconcilable as Trotzky, but more in the background, less seemingly assertive with his colleagues, but equally determined to have his own way, is the shrewd and apparently apathetic Man of Steel. In a postscript to his last political testament, Lenin, during a period of exasperation, wrote recommending the removal of Stalin as Secretary of the Central Committee, characterizing him as "rough and disloyal," but Stalin—a man of deliberate but careful action, and an organizer—in his cold and calculating way had gained power and has held his power by a remarkable strength of will and phenomenal astuteness in manipulation. He gradu-

ally, but surely, became the uncrowned leader of the Communist Party and is, to-day, Stalin the Dictator, while claiming and pretending to be a fervid disciple of Lenin and a servant of the people. For Stalin, it is said, "there is only one Marx, and Lenin is his prophet," but according to Stalin himself there is, and can be, only one arbitrary and despotic dictator in Russia, and his name is Stalin.

Trotsky, with his vitriolic words, desperately fought Stalin, the "hard-boiled," calculating man of decisive deeds, before the Central Committee in October, 1927—already "fixed" for and by Stalin—and said, "Stalin's momentary victory in the organization will have for its consequence his political shipwreck. The roughness and disloyalty, of which Lenin wrote, are no longer personal qualities; they are characteristic qualities of the ruling group, both in its own policy and in the guidance of the organization." Trotsky's passionate speech was drowned in a chorus of abusive outcries; Stalin, in reply, quietly stated that he had twice tendered his resignation, but the Party (as he well knew they would) had on both occasions refused to even consider his withdrawal. Trotsky was fortunate to escape with his head, for only Stalin's cold-reasoning brain saved him. Trotsky, it is well known, had enjoyed at times a large, personal following, including many in the army. Stalin, for effect and as an example of his tolerance and fearlessness, gave him the opportunity to leave the country and accept exile—a boon denied Russians; and then with Trotsky in Constantinople—a man absolutely without a country, and unwanted everywhere—Stalin unobtrusively commenced, by propaganda, to blacken Trotsky's "per-

sonal and political" character in a campaign that effectively reached all classes of people in the Soviet Union. It is amusing to read of the dictatorship of Russia to-day branding Trotzky, throughout the Soviet Union, as a "recalcitrant communist in the service of the bourgeoisie"; one who has "sold himself" to the bourgeois publisher and press, receiving "large sums of money to write slanderous articles about the Soviet Union." Trotzky, the rabid Red, as fiery, mercurial and as ruthlessly destructive as ever if he had an opportunity to show himself again in a bloody social arena, exiled in Turkey, writes of and preaches incessantly his doctrine of "World revolution" and "Down with all forms of capitalism"—a doctrine and policy that Russia and Stalin himself are fully determined and are pledged to adopt "at the proper time," which means when they are ready.

W. H. Chamberlain, in "Soviet Russia," depicts Lenin as "one of the greatest haters of all time." Lenin never had any feeling of patriotism for either his country or his fellow countrymen. He was an internationalist in every sense of the word. He was accused, during the war, of being a German spy; he used German money and spread German propaganda to weaken the spirit of nationalism in the Russian army; he fought the Kerensky Social Democratic Provisional Government of Russia (following the collapse and repudiation of Czarism) and, by his prestige, frenzied ardor and authority, wrested a bare majority vote in the Party Central Committee for the signature of the ruthless Brest-Litovsk peace, dictated by the German Government. To create the new Soviet State, Lenin ac-

cepted overwhelming humiliation for Russia with Germany's hypocritical good will and temporary help, and he freed the German armies on the Eastern front so they could strengthen the offensive against France, Britain, Italy and their allies, including the United States.

As far as the great World War was concerned, Lenin was the Russian Judas, but this fact never bothered Lenin, for he denounced all phases and all obligations and loyalties of nationalism. His hatred was directed at kings, aristocrats, plutocrats, and every type and degree of so-called privilege and capitalism. He branded all private property (no matter how acquired), as well as hereditary privilege, as capitalism, and claimed that such was the chief instrument of human enslavement. He was right when he declared, however, that all the casualties of the war were victims of the inevitable clash between competing imperialisms.

Lenin, in a message sent to the workers of America in 1918, stated that the bourgeoisie of international imperialisms had killed ten million and mutilated twenty million in "their war" to decide which national robbers should "rule over the whole world," and he adds, "If our war, the war of the suppressed and exploited against the oppressors and exploiters, will cost half a million or a million victims in all countries, the bourgeoisie will say that the first victims are justified and the second are not," but, he continues, "The proletariat will give quite another answer."

Thirteen years have passed. Lenin is dead. The Russian Revolution, and its fostering of a world revolution, has killed its many millions by war, exile,

starvation, torture and executions; to-day, two million of the Russian Communist Party "oppress and exploit" the Soviet Union population of some one hundred and sixty millions, and individual human liberty in Russia has been effectively crucified. Even the two million new aristocrats, and the privileged in Russia's new social order, are under the thumb and knout of the dictators and are denied any measure of real freedom, or the peaceful enjoyment of God-given human rights.

Lenin, during his last years, was a sort of figure-head of the Communist dictatorship—the Cheka, the terrorism, the materialism, and the mechanistic, inhuman force of the revolution, with its associated censorship, becoming stronger than he was. Lenin sent Bela Kun to pacify the Crimea after an uprising and, at Lenin's suggestion, an amnesty was published among the anti-Bolshevik officers and leaders who were requested to register, with Lenin's name pledged for their personal safety. Some thirty thousand leaders, who had been opposing the Bolshevik brand of Communism, registered and fell into a typically Russian Communist trap. Bela Kun, instructed and supported by the Cheka, erected forests of scaffolds and hanged all of the many thousands of former belligerents—lulled into a defenseless position and insecurity by the general pardon decree—that his soldiers and spies, assisted by the uniformed and secret police, could find. It is said that Lenin had no knowledge of this atrocity and refused to consider, as warranted, the excuse of "military necessity"; nevertheless Bela Kun was not disciplined, but continued in high favor with the Ruling Committee, the Cheka and the Army.

Apologists for the historical word and record and eulogists of Lenin (all of Communist taint) have said that the great Communist leader personally hated blood. Perhaps he did, but, as a terroristic "Red" revolutionist, he certainly never hesitated to make decrees and even to give specific orders that led to the shedding of rivers of it. On the second night following his usurpation of authority and rise to power, when asked what should be done with some eight hundred military cadets—mere boys—captured by the "Reds," the "saintly" and hydrocephalic Lenin shrugged his shoulders and replied with a curse, "What do I care what you do with them?" It is unnecessary to add that these children were immediately butchered. This episode has been well described as "a portentous and most significant beginning of the new Communist savior of mankind."

Nikiforov, the Russian novelist, puts in the mouth of one of his characters the words, "I see a man who would purify this earth with the power of a great hate so as to prepare it for the cultivation of a new civilization and a new life." Such a man, communists say, was Lenin. But whereas Lenin expressed "a great hate," he was incapable of contributing one iota to any work of purification. Lenin swept aside much that was sordid dirt, but he placed filth in its place; he removed injustice and substituted a greater injustice; he operated on a sick patient and killed him. Lenin was not a doctor or a savior; he was a destroyer.

Lenin said, "Bolshevism is not a young ladies' boarding-school. Children should be present at executions and should rejoice in the death of the ene-

mies of the proletariat," and again, "We must hate—hatred is the basis of Communism. Children must be taught to hate their parents if such are not Communists; if they are, then the child need not respect them—need not longer worry about them." Lenin taught that to gain the end desired and demanded by Communism the individual would have to be disregarded as a human being. The communist should be prepared to sacrifice, to suffer, and even to die for the ultimate victory of proletarian Communism; what happened to the rest of humanity that stood in their way, resisted their progress, or refused to stand with them, shoulder to shoulder, need give the Red comrades no concern—they had to be removed or destroyed. Morality, pity, mercy, the humanities, as well as honesty, truth and justice, all had to be cast aside by communists; they were worn-out bourgeois virtues. Nothing must stand in the way of the advance of Communism throughout the entire world; all obstructions must be removed. "It would not matter a jot," exclaimed the saintly Lenin, "if three-quarters of the human race perished; the important thing is that the remaining quarter should be Communists."

This bigoted "class" deifier preached communist hatred of all but a selected group of the lowest; he addressed the masses as "Tavarashi" (comrades), without either emotion or charm, but made them believe his earnestness and sincerity, so that the mob were stricken by hero-worship and cried, "Long live the Savior of Russia; long live the Dictator of the Poor." Yet this "lover of his fellow man," this admirable "Twentieth-Century Christ,"

declared, "What does it matter if ninety per cent. are destroyed—so long as ten per cent. of Communists are left to carry on the revolution?"

George Seldes says of Lenin, "In battle with his enemies, he was uncompromising and without pity. His political wisdom was great. He understood mob psychology thoroughly, but was a little weak in his grasp of individual psychology; he never made a mistake in dealing with the masses, but he frequently did in choosing men. He had no warmth; he was coldly intellectual," and he adds, "Now, Lenin is dead and worshiped by the peasants. Some never knew him but as another Czar who supplemented the goodness of that Alexander who freed the slaves by apportioning the soil. A myth is growing throughout Russia, and a legend. He was divine, of immaculate birth, and he did not die, but ascended into heaven, where he sits by the side of the Trinity as a special intercessor for poor Russian peasants. This making of a Red god pleases all good, atheistic Bolsheviks."

The younger generation in Russia have, to a certain degree, succumbed to the persistent and relentless drive against religion and God. Communism is becoming the State religion. It is offered as the greatest thing in the world, as something idealistic, something to replace Christianity, with Lenin as the Russian Communist's Christ. The Communist Party has done all it could, and continues to do all it can, to foster the exaltation of Lenin as a leader of the revolution and the "savior" of the poor. Lenin's busts and pictures cover Russia; they are encountered everywhere. His tomb is the "holy of

holies"; thousands pass through it daily in apparent awe and reverence.

Trotsky is reported to have said, when standing before the mausoleum of Lenin immediately prior to his exile: "He is alive, although dead; and I am dead, although alive." Religion in Russia is outlawed, but the poor, ignorant peasants, who are an overwhelming majority of the population in the Soviet Union, think of the myth of Lenin as comrade and savior, and substitute for the worship of Christ (the Man of Love and Prince of Peace) that of Lenin,—the man of hate and the leader of the world's bloodiest, most inhuman and terroristic revolution, destructive of man's God-given rights, of all social justice and of individual liberty.

II.

FORCED LABOR IN SOVIET RUSSIA

SOVIET RUSSIA is a political Union or nation of some one hundred and sixty million people and some one hundred and ninety-two different races and tongues, all of whom (who are decreed as "old enough") are forced to work for their masters when, where, how, and at what these despotic overlords dictate, and for merely nominal wages, with necessary rations, shelter, restricted and regulated privileges, etc., all arbitrarily decreed by the dictator, who not only subjugates and enslaves all labor and robs all people of all freedom of action, of speech, of assembly, of bargaining, of the press, of mode of life, of choice of occupation, of religious liberty and of thought itself, but forcibly reduces them to a low standard of spineless slave life, which would not have been tolerated on the worst of our old Southern plantations.

The United States boasts (1) of its citizens' birthright of liberty and independence, and (2) that it enjoys and maintains the highest standard of living of any country in the world. Soviet Russia has the unique distinction of admitting that it is ruled by a dictatorship that is diametrically opposed to every human and progressive conception of individual liberty and democratic government, and that it is deliberately and forcibly dominating its people to-day, compelling them to "sacrifice for the future" and put up with a plane of living so low and inhuman that no white race, other than the op-

pressed Russians, would tolerate it for a moment; and all this so that Russia shall become a strong, self-supporting and self-arming, powerful, militaristic, communist nation that, under the blood-and-iron policy of its dictators, shall lead to, promote and force a world revolution and the ascendancy to power of the international proletariat in all lands.

Russia is anti-democratic and anti-capitalistic in both thought and deed—which means positive opposition to individual human liberty and any ownership of private property. It stands forth self-announced as anti-American; it refuses to see any good or virtue in our political and social principles and institutions, and all that we hold dear in the realm of human liberties it is pledged to destroy.

Communism exists to-day as a great political, social and economic force to be reckoned with and a "Red" menace to every democracy and to all human liberty and individual freedom throughout the world, not only because it has been indifferently tolerated in the past by democratic, free peoples, but because many admittedly anti-Bolshevistic and progressive nations, including the United States, have definitely encouraged and supported it and contributed to its upbuilding, during recent years, with machinery, money and brains.

Only under an absolute autocratic dictatorship could the Russian Communist Five-Year Plan have been conceived as possible of execution. Only under (1) terrorism, inhuman persecution, the Cheka, the gallows, the symbolized Russian knout, the threat of hunger and of being "outcast," and (2) the influence of war psychology and of war propaganda (economic and class), war-drafting of the workers,

with military tyranny and prison discipline, could the so-called Five-Year Plan have been attempted and worked or developed to an appreciable, important extent. Only because of a stupidly thoughtless, selfish, short-sighted, or deliberate disloyalty to country—which is treason in fact—on the part of supposedly liberty-loving citizens of free democratic nations could the Russian Communist Five-Year Plan have lived long enough to get a definite, perceptible start and show material progress.

Eve Garrette Grady, the wife of an American mining engineer, who has recently returned from Russia, in "Seeing Red" says, "The unemployed in the bread-lines of New York City are better off than the working man of Soviet Russia; they have more to eat, more to wear, and a better place to sleep, even if it happens to be a park bench or a Bowery hotel. The drought sufferers in the Southwest, the American farmer whose cries for relief rise to the heavens, are favored of the gods in comparison with the Russian tiller of the soil, for communist Russia enjoys the unique distinction of having the lowest standard of living of any so-called civilized country in the world to-day. . . . The terrors of underworld warfare in our gangster-ridden cities pale in comparison with the gang rule of Red Russia. There no man is free. No man can call his soul his own. No man knows when his hour has come; when he will be spirited away by the G. P. U., Russia's secret police, perhaps never to be seen again . . . Soviet Russia! The land in which a small, organized group of men acts as the mind, the soul and the body of all Russians; a few which tell all the rest what they must eat and how much, what

they must wear, how they must live and where, and what they must think—and further see to it that their commands are obeyed. Soviet Russia, where Sunday is abolished, religion stamped out; where family life is archaic and must be disintegrated . . . where woman is emancipated, and where chastity, mercy and truth are 'bourgeois' virtues . . . Soviet Russia, shrieking from the housetops that she is the only country in the world without unemployment."

The Russian Communists ignore the fact that France, the most democratic nation on earth to-day, as well as thoroughly capitalistic, has no unemployment and has imported during recent years some one and a half million foreigners to help her national labor shortage—all of whom can be expatriated by France if such is considered desirable or necessary and in the economic interest of French labor.

Mrs. Grady pithily asks, "Why should there be unemployment in Soviet Russia where thirty-five billions of dollars are being spent on capital construction?" with, it is proper to add, the advice and assistance of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy and other nations and peoples. As a matter of fact, one of Stalin's great problems to-day is to make industrial workers out of many of the peasants who want to continue to work on the land—not in a factory, mine, or forest, or on building construction and developments; another is to make effective and profitable "beasts of burden" out of so-called emancipated women who have found that "emancipation" from the cooking fire and oven, and from the domestic wash and cleaning-broom, has led to their assignment, by the

authorities in power, to crude and brutal, arduous work—pushing mine-cars; digging ditches, loading timber, raw and manufactured products; functioning as pack-animals and as unskilled labor in building construction and factory operations, etc.

It is significant that on the Communist International Women's Day in March, last year, Russian official newspapers carried large posters of a woman driving a tractor over cooking utensils, dishes, powder-puffs and other feminine accoutrements and appliances. This illustrates the "philosophy" of Communism with respect to the status and obligations of women. Work is not only a universal duty for both sexes, but jobs are decreed and assigned to each person by the State, and women are to be deprived in many respects of much that is termed femininity and made into industrial, agricultural and military Amazons. The "man-power" of the Soviet Union is to be virtually doubled by forcing women to work, the same as men. Calvin B. Hoover, in "The Economic Life of Soviet Russia" (the work of an excellent analytical and discriminating economist), says, "It is not the policy of Communism that some women shall normally be housekeepers. As rapidly as possible the economic and social system is being changed, so that the place of women will be no more in the home. This is being made possible by the rapid dissolution of the family, which is considered a desirable end, in itself, by many Communists. As soon as possible it is intended that all children will be taken care of in crèches until school age. Likewise, public feeding is being developed as rapidly as possible, so that the prepara-

tion of food will no longer be carried on in the individual family."

Russia, during the past eighteen months, has been making much use, in its "authoritative" communist propaganda, of the unemployment situation in all capitalistic countries and—what in reality is a positive fallacy, viz., "that there is no unemployment in Russia," has been and continues to be boastfully presented as "undeniable proof" of the superiority, for the worker, of the Soviet communist, economic and political system. It is true that no experienced factory, construction, mine, or other industrial workers need be unemployed in Russia to-day—that is, if they want to work, are members in good standing of one of the many Unions, and are conformists as far as the decrees of the Communists are concerned. But where are the many millions of the disfranchised and the outlawed or "dismissed"; the old aristocrats and one-time property holders, the bourgeoisie and all of the worthy middle classes—educated and relatively solid,—which form part of the excluded and repudiated element of the population? Where are the millions of Kulaks and Seredniaks—the poor peasants branded as "rich," with "private property," minds, and, therefore, of the bourgeoisie or middle class—that are being "liquidated" by a cruel, arbitrary decree? Where are "the people who were," the truly refined and intelligent, the members of professions, merchants, bankers, etc., condemned to extermination? Where are the social democrats, the socialists, or even the Communists and anarchists, the Mensheviks, the Social Revolutionists of the Narodniki tradition, some of whom were just as radical and as Red as the Bolshe-

vists, but were competitors in the quest of power? Why are not the outcasts, the repudiated, the "dismissed," i.e., those "struck off the employment register," classed as and counted among the vast army of Russia's unemployed?

"In no other European country," says Calvin B. Hoover, "are the evidences of extreme poverty and misery more obtrusive than in the Soviet Union. In no other European country are the beggars so poorly clad or so hopelessly miserable in appearance. In few countries are there so many of them." Who are these beggars who are so numerous in this much-vaunted Russian "Communist Utopia"? Most of them (excluding the large army of homeless waifs) consist of those untold millions of persons known as the "deprived," the "declassed," or the disfranchised, such as former landlords, aristocrats, Czarist officials, bourgeoisie (middle class) merchants; "individualistic" professional men and educators; scholars and "intelligentsia" who did not take kindly to the Marxian brand of Communism as interpreted by Lenin and Stalin; priests and ecclesiastics of every church and creed; Czarist or "White" army officers; bankers; industrial and commercial leaders; the better class of peasants, or even the very poor ones who would not be forced into collectivism; Nepmen, or private producers, or traders, etc.—all with their families.

All of this ostracized, persecuted and condemned class, when deprived of "constitutional rights"—a ridiculous, ambiguous and equivocal term, freely used, however, in a land that neither grants nor acknowledges the existence of such "rights,"—not only loses the advantages of "citizenship" (which

means being recognized by the dictatorship of the State as existing and as available for work), but is also deprived of food and ration cards, of the right to possess a co-operative card, of the right to be employed by any state or co-operative organization, of the right to "register" and apply for work, and of the right to send their children to school beyond the Second Grade Primary.

None of the much-talked-of phases of the Communist System of "Social Insurance" applies to the disfranchised and the "deprived," but such are likewise not for the peasant and agricultural classes. These communist benefits are only for the manual workers in factories, the so-called proletarians who, dominated by the party in power, are deliberately and with a definite and long-headed intent given social and economic "sugar" (figuratively speaking), with class benefits and privileges; for the dictator well knows that the one class whose adherence he and the party can expect to have, and whose support they must have, is the urban proletariat—the manual worker, organized and officered by Communist trade unions. The peasant in Russia is not considered a proletarian. As the rural population outnumbers the urban five to one, the Communists say that the State could not afford to extend any of its "politic" measures, inaugurated to salve "insiders," to the vast peasant body whom they feel that they can terrorize, control and subjugate by brutal force,—a policy, they state, that is both cheaper and safer in the end for them.

Moreover, with respect to unemployment, the general term, as used in democratic and so-called capitalistic states, is not applicable to Russia, where

the State arbitrarily decrees who shall and who shall not work, and where all privileged to work must work—and this, at the task allotted and nowhere else. We do not speak of “unemployment” in a military army, on a slave plantation, or in a penitentiary.

When men are drafted or conscripted into an army they lose all their liberty of action; they become part of a machine. They are required and compelled to obey any and all orders; they are given no personal choice. This condition exists in Russia *in toto*. There can be no such thing as unemployment in a conscripted military army; in this sense there is none, or should be none, in Russia, for the Soviet Union is at war—at present primarily in the economic realm; it drafts all the labor that it wants and discards into a sort of human junk-pile those whom it does not want; and all who can work and are permitted to work are assigned tasks, like soldiers, and are subjected to discipline far more severe, exacting and humiliating than that affecting any army or any other people in the world. In a military army, men are given a periodic leave of absence; in Soviet Russia (within the confines of the border of the Union) there are no such relaxing or “free” sessions—the pressure of drastic discipline is relentlessly and constantly maintained, both at work and when away from work. Soldiers in military armies in “capitalistic” countries have liberty of thought, but not so in Russia. Every printed and informative word, radio program, “movie” and “talkie,” stage performance, etc., is censored, and secret police and spies abound on every hand, so no man

knows who his enemy is, and no man dares to express himself freely and honestly.

There can be no such thing as "unemployment" on a plantation operated entirely with slave labor. Slaves are held in bondage and in a state of compulsory subjection and servitude. Slaves, to live, must work and be useful to their masters. If they do not work, they die; if they do but little work or indifferent work, and if they are careless, and damage property and tools, they are punished; if they attempt to escape they will either be recaptured and severely treated or shot; they cannot wander from one plantation to another; they cannot choose their jobs. If they are obedient to the commands of their owners and work well, they will be fed, housed and clothed. This is the condition existing in Russia to-day among the most favored of the population. A large percentage of the Russian people, however, have neither the social standing in the eyes of the dictator, nor enjoy the great boon of food, housing and clothing that is granted the plantation slave.

In a prison, where men are incarcerated and sentenced by the State to labor, there is no "unemployment," for the authorities dictate all that shall be done by the prisoners, control all their activities by force, and prescribe duties that they are compelled to do when, where, and as ordered, if they desire to avoid punishment and live. A prisoner has no freedom of movement beyond that decreed by the authorities. If he works, he is fed and given a cot to sleep on; if he does not work, he is punished until his instinctive self-preservation asserts itself and he capitulates and conforms to the power and dictates of the State. Russia is a vast and soulless prison for

its people, who are robbed of all freedom, individuality and self-respect. They cannot escape from its boundaries, and, to live, they must work as decreed by the State when, where, and as arbitrarily decreed. The Russian peasant, every class of Russian life, and the proletariat themselves are all in bondage, bound and fettered, in a "Zion of Hope" which in reality is a cruelly disillusioning "Utopia in Chains" to all classes of the Russian people.

We read that "The Economic System of the Soviet Union has the possibility of preventing unemployment to an extent which is almost impossible for the unmodified capitalistic system." As democratic peoples, in countries functioning under laws prescribed and legislated by the people themselves (with governments by, for, and of the people), do not countenance, and would not tolerate, all labor being arbitrarily drafted or conscripted, enslaved in absolute bondage or of the prison variety—with all of its associated restrictions, arbitrary control, loss of liberty, and compulsion by coercion and force—we will admit that there will always be some measure of unemployment under the democratic and capitalistic system, for, in every land where men are free, some may care to work; some may desire to work for months and then take a long rest; some may practise self-denial and, by thrift, save during the best productive years of their life and retire from steady work as their powers pass the meridian; some may want to move around the country; some may even like to be tramps or vagabonds; some may imagine themselves poets, artists and Bohemians, talk much, fuss around and actually "sponge" on others; some may prefer living on charity (or on

“easy marks” and the gullible) to work, and there will be many, with some inherited, developed, or contracted physical weakness, that are neither fit nor capable of working, and are supported by others in a willing and altruistic spirit of human brotherhood and compassion for the unfortunate.

The Soviet Union, which alone of all the governments of the world, past and present, has the power, the desire and the determination to force all of its people to obey its arbitrary dictates in every phase and walk of life at all times and under all conditions, naturally can, in its arrogant brutality and absolutism, prevent unemployment to an extent which is impossible in any capitalistic land. Democratic-capitalistic countries with their peoples are, however, unalterably opposed to the tyrannical and soulless enslaving, conscription, imprisoning, restraint and bondage of their labor, with the associated deprivation of all liberty and all human rights, of individual initiative, of private property, and of all manhood.

It is amazing, after reading the propaganda that “there is no unemployment in Russia,” as officially and persistently broadcast by the Soviets, to note in their authoritative statistics (Data on Social Insurance) that the “average yearly number of persons receiving unemployment relief” in the fiscal year 1928-29 was 854,300, as compared with 657,900 during the preceding year (and 541,600 “estimated” for the year ending in 1930). About 12 per cent. of the cost of the entire Social Insurance is said to be for “Unemployment Aid.”

The Russian Social Insurance Plan is most excellent in theory and is full of merit if worked out hon-

estly. At present, it is to a very great degree mere "window-dressing," a peg "to hang one's hat on," and a picture of claimed social idealism on which the limelight is focused to show capitalistic peoples what Communism is doing for the working man. It has been said, however, by competent and unbiased investigators, that "the System of Social Insurance in Soviet Russia has not yet developed to equality with that of the more advanced capitalistic countries, such as Germany"; it applies to less than 12 per cent. of the inhabitants of so-called "working age," is restricted to acknowledged proletarians, and does not include the peasantry.

It is surprising that in a country which boasts of having no unemployment, and under a social system which claims that not only is unemployment tabu, but that "it is impossible" (excluding, of course, the millions of unemployed who have been deprived, outlawed and condemned) that in the fiscal year 1928-29 the Social Insurance of the Soviet Union paid unemployment benefits to 8 per cent. of the total number of workers insured. It is said that a drive was made to investigate why this condition should exist, and a Chistka ("cleaning") was conducted of certain offices and exchanges. Orders quickly followed, reducing the number of persons receiving unemployment compensation "in order to lessen the strain upon the funds available for making the payments." In October, 1930, the Commissariat of Labor declared a change in the system which was so far-reaching as to cause what was virtually a temporary abandonment of unemployment insurance. Loafers, slackers, and bluffers, and what are termed the "too particular" were generally

smoked out, and those who were registered for work, or unemployment insurance benefits, who could not get work that they could do were ordered to take any job offered, and take it quickly, no matter what or where it was. No excuse in the future would be tolerated, such as specialized training and mental non-adaptability, and even physical disability would not be accepted as an excuse unless such was proved to the satisfaction of the exacting and critical Soviet authorities by especially-appointed Soviet physicians. If a teacher cannot get a job as a teacher to-day, he has to go to work, probably as an unskilled laborer, wherever such labor is needed—usually on construction work. Any person refusing to report for work at any job assigned at any time, anywhere, cannot possibly stay on the unemployment list—he is dropped and is in line for all sorts of trouble and persecution. This policy of the Communists, with respect to Social Insurance and unemployment, follows earlier general orders to limit the right of any individual to choose his work, or the type and location of his work, and change it for some other kind of work if he doesn't like it; such human freedom is not for Russian labor.

It is significant that whereas American and West European "capitalistic" countries consider old-age pensions as of prime importance in social and humane plans developed for the benefit of the workers, the Russian official statements of disbursements do not show any outlay whatsoever for this worthy purpose in the fiscal year 1927-28 and only three-tenths of one per cent. of the total expended in the interest of workers during the following year.

W. H. Chamberlain feels that unemployment re-

mains the bane of the wage-earner under the Soviet Communist System as under capitalism. He says in "Soviet Russia" (Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1930) that in October, 1928, there were 1,344,000 persons without jobs registered on the Labor Exchanges of the Soviet Union, of which some 100,000 were construction workers; 200,000, skilled or semi-skilled workers; 300,000, clerical or "white collar" workers, 400,000, unskilled laborers, and the balance were persons seeking work for the first time. Peasants (who constitute some four-fifths of the population) are not considered in the preparation of any Soviet official "unemployment" figures.

The statement has very generally been made that Russia's prime trouble and weakness, as far as Communism is concerned, is her tremendous peasant population. One economist said, "If agriculture in Russia were actually to be rationalized and mechanized, at least twenty-five millions of the present population would have to be sent into exile; for there would be nothing for them to do. So long as agriculture is carried on largely by human labor, these people find employment. With the complete introduction of large-scale methods of production, these people would be unemployed." Contrary to the prevailing impression, there are no large amounts of untilled lands in Russia; increased acreage for crops can be obtained only by extensive irrigation, drainage and other ameliorative operations. Unless the rationalization and mechanization of agriculture is synchronized with the development and needs of industry for man-power, there will be many displaced peasants without employment. Moreover, the large amount of labor now being

used in Russia for construction and development work is not a permanent demand, like the operating force in factories, mines, forests, offices, or the people steadily engaged in transportation, distribution, etc. When plant construction is finished and improvements completed (now under process to an extraordinary and unprecedented extent), what will become of the very large construction squads? Stalin tried, in his brutal way, to cope, to a degree, with this condition by first classifying the peasants and then coolly ordering the "liquidation" or extermination of the Kulaki. We are told that whereas at least five million of the Kulaki, known as the best, most industrious and, therefore, the most prosperous peasants, were expected to be affected by this enforced "liquidation," yet, "on account of the difficulty of distinguishing between the Seredniak and the Kulak, the eventual result was that a much larger number were involved." The Kulaki could not go to work anywhere when their land and all their property of every kind and nature were confiscated; they could join no union, and if found working on any job they were rigorously "cleaned out" and turned adrift; they were ordered from the start of the drastic "liquidation," with its persecution, to immediately leave the village or district where they had lived, where they were known and where they supposedly had some friends; if they refused or offered any resistance they were shot; many committed suicide; many of the passive and seemingly helpless were tightly packed into freight-cars and shipped into exile—to die.

During the height of Stalin's campaign to reduce Russia's agricultural population, even the

Bedniki—the poorest of the poor—were not safe. The official publication (*Izvestia*, March 20, 1930) reports an old peasant, who had three sheep and whose total possessions were valued at 215 rubles (about one hundred dollars, according to a liberal interpretation of exchange), being listed as a Kulak and his property confiscated. Another man, seventy years of age, was expropriated because, some thirty years before, he had engaged in trade to a very small extent for a short time and, therefore, must be, in his sympathies and leaning, capitalistic. Any peasant who was known to oppose collectivization (or was suspected) was almost sure to be listed as a Kulak. If Russia had permitted Stalin to go through with his diabolical plan of “liquidation” as aggressively, harshly, and rapidly as he had planned it, all the upper strata, the brains, the industrious and most of the “quality,” of the peasant class would have been speedily extirpated.

Russia, the Utopia of Parlor Socialists and of bloody, Revolutionary Reds, is “in chains,” and some nine-tenths of the entire population are not only fettered with the proletariat in cruel bondage, but are on the rack of physical and mental torture. There is not a scintilla of individual human liberty in any part of Russia to-day, and in Russian communism there is not one speck of humanity, not one atom of human brotherhood or human pity; all that is fine, unselfish and noble in man—the development of tens of thousands of years,—and all that is spiritual in the universe Communism unhesitatingly repudiates and disclaims.

Soviet Russia is not governed by a majority in

power. (There are no "parties" that have either legal standing or existence; only one—the Party.) It is not governed by a "class," such as "the working class," as is so often falsely claimed, for some four-fifths of the so-called lower, or working, class are engaged in agriculture—and such have no voice in government. The Soviet Union is under the domination of a relatively small group of desperate and fanatical men, once known as the Bolsheviks—the deepest Red branch of the Russian Revolutionist "Socialists"; then, as Russian Social Democrats and, later, as "The Russian Communist Party." When the name "Russia" (in 1923) was changed to the Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics—in order to please the International and prepare the way for the inclusion in the Union of other Soviet Republics—the name of the "Red" Bolshevik Communist Party was changed to the All-Union Communist Party. At that time, 63 per cent. of the members were called "workers"; 29.4 per cent., "employees" (white collar and from the *Intelligentsia*, i.e., labor other than manual workers), and 7.6 per cent. were peasants or agricultural labor. In 1928, the membership had changed to 60.8 per cent. manual workers, 19.9 per cent. "employees" and *Intelligentsia*, and 19.3 per cent. agricultural, rural, or village laborers. Sherwood Eddy, in "The Challenge of Russia" (1931), says that of the 1,853,090 members of the Communist Party, according to information furnished by the Statistical Department of the Gosplan (the State Planning Commission) in August, 1930, only some 1,200,000 were full members and about 650,000 probationary candidates. He also states that the youths' and chil-

dren's organizations (which have an enrolment of some six million), with the Trade Unions, will furnish the majority of recruits prepared for future membership in the Party. The Party, however, is very exclusive and particular; it is periodically purged and its dead-wood pruned; no man can continue as a member of the Communist Party unless he is a hard-working, single-minded, fanatical man, willing to give his "all" and, if necessary, suffer martyrdom for "the cause."

The Trade Unions in Russia, having been created by the Communist Party and being controlled by them, do not and cannot protect the workers against exploitation. There is definite and soulless exploitation of the proletariat by a dictatorship professedly of the proletariat, which is not the proletariat at all, but merely an absolute autocratic Communist despot; this dictator rules the Trade Unions, the Communist Party, the Soviet Cabinet (Council of People's Commissars), the Tsik (or All-Union Central Soviet Executive Committee), and all other Communist committees and organizations up to the Third International and "the general staff of the world revolution."

Russian labor (even that of Trade Unions) has no right of bargaining for pay, for hours of labor, rest days, or conditions of employment, etc.; has no right to strike or even suggest such action, and has no say whatsoever with respect to a living wage and plane of living, food or housing conditions. All such things, vital to human freedom, to human enjoyment and to life itself, are peremptorily decreed by the Communist authority above; and all workers—if they desire to live—must obey the edicts of Stalin,

the Almighty, and, if they do not want to be punished, must not criticize orders or conditions, or comment unfavorably thereon, for spies are placed throughout the ranks to rout out the recalcitrant and the "disloyal" trouble-makers.

All labor, to have any standing in Soviet Russia, must be organized in a Trade Union. The present Labor or Trade Unions in the Soviet Union have come into existence since the revolution, and it is significant that the Labor Union movement in Russia is distinctively communistic in support and feeling; it was created by, and has been sponsored and developed by, the Communists. Russian Labor Unions are, and have to be, in sympathy with and take their orders from the Communist dictator; they are supposed to represent the workers; actually, they represent the Communists and dominate the workers. "Since the Communist Party constitutes the leadership of the dictatorship of the proletariat," says C. B. Hoover, "it is considered logical that it should also guide and dominate the Labor Unions. The Labor Unions, on the other hand, are one of the institutions upon which the Party relies to maintain its contact with the proletariat, and thus we find a system of interlocking relationships between the Labor Unions, the Soviets and the Party, which is unique in its closely-knit quality." This same interlocking system is prevalent throughout the entire range of Communist interests and manifestations. The prime object is subtle control, or, in plain words, deception with respect to both dictatorship and the placing of responsibility for action.

Russia is governed by an arbitrary autocratic dic-

tator, who functions through committees, the Communist Party, the Trade Unions, the International, the Army and G. P. U. (the Cheka of old). He controls some two million members of the Communist Party (about $11\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of the population), and they in turn control the trade unions and the proletariat; there are unions for every class of work, and the possession of a trade-union card carries with it such tremendous benefits and privileges that it is natural for adult workers of all types, if they want to live, to desire to be enrolled. It is possible that all the trade unions in Russia to-day will show an aggregate membership (including Communists and members of the League of Communist Youth—Komsomols) of some ten or eleven millions, all of which, with the army and secret police (G. P. U.—Cheka) of approaching one and a half million men, are under unrelaxing militaristic discipline. The remainder of the population, some of whom possess the very dubious “boon” of citizenship (or, in any event, they have not been officially disfranchised and are permitted to raise their hands at elections—under the supervision of the dreaded secret police), are definitely subjected to just as crude and tyrannical conscription by force as if the country were at war and being attacked by a foreign foe. Russia is, in fact, a nation at war; it is branded at this time and at this stage merely as economic warfare, of Russian Communism against a capitalistic world, but it is a war—a diabolical war of one low class against Democracy—to be waged to the death. The Communists and Trade-Union members are soldiers who have volunteered—or at least have been influenced to enlist. The remainder of

the population of Russia, men, women, youths and young girls, all of whom are supposedly of working age (and many who are not), are conscripted by the Soviet Union.

Eve Garrette Grady, in "Seeing Red," says, "Whether they like it or not, they are forced to work for a cause—the building of Communism—world revolution. All labor in Russia has long since been drafted—every plant, animal, factory, and all individual capital conscripted. Even women, whom Lenin freed from the drudgery of the kitchen, are serving under Russia's draft. None of these people offer themselves voluntarily. They are assigned to duty in the ranks where and when orders from the top direct them to go. Resign they dare not, for the penalty of desertion is death—death, quick and sudden, at the point of the court-martial gun; or death, slow and tortuous, by starvation," and, again, "Consider the following decree of the Commissariat of Labor, published on November 5th, 1930: 'Skilled workmen refusing the work offered to them are put onto unskilled, heavy labor, and if they refuse this they are struck off the employment register.' Not a very sinister ruling on the face of it, is it? But just exactly what does being 'struck off the employment register' mean? It means, first, that a man is deprived of his food book—the greatest calamity that can befall a Russian. Loss of the food book means the loss of the right to buy in the stores—in other words, starvation by slow inches. Second, he is ejected from his lodgings. Only those on the employment register have the right to shelter, the right to a roof over their heads. So there is the very excellent possibility of death from exposure, for a man

deprived of his lodgings during the Russian winter cannot long survive. It means that he cannot buy medicine, or even see a doctor, for only those in good standing on employment registers have that privilege. Furthermore, he becomes a social outcast, a pariah, for no man or woman is going to run the risk of giving him succor. The Argus-eyed secret police, the G. P. U., are ever alert to apprehend friends of deserters from the glorious cause of building for Socialism."

Russians who are willing to work in their home town or village, or who are quite willing to go elsewhere if their families can go with them and live with some degree of decency, but who object, for definite cause, to duties in locations that may be arbitrarily assigned them, are branded as deserters of the "noble" cause of Communism, if they do not appear for work exactly when, where, and as ordered, no matter how horrible the location or setting, or loathsome the nature of the work to which they, with good reasons, may object. Such men, branded as renegades, are apprehended by the G. P. U., and the mildest punishment inflicted is dismissal and being "struck off the employment register," with "no other employment" for a stipulated period of time. Such a decision, with order peremptorily handed down by the office of the Commissariat of Labor, generally concludes with the ominous words, "Any administration giving this convicted man a job will be held responsible." This drastic punishment, which, in plain words, is a practical operation of the death penalty by hunger and exposure, is even meted out to "the élite" (Communist and Trade-Union members) as well as to

the conscripted slaves. No so-called "nonsense" is tolerated by the dictator, even from a proletariat of proletarian ancestry.

Other Russians, deemed of peculiar and cogent importance, at the moment, to the Soviet Union, because of training, experience and peculiar knowledge or ability, are not merely "struck off the employment register" if they object to a change of job or of location. They, like all other Russians, are given no choice and no preference; health, family, deep interest in or a consecrated devotion to what one is doing, all count for nothing with "the powers that be." Such a Russian may be offered a different job in some other part of the country; he protests and objects, giving real weighty and plausible reasons for his opposition; at times, even from his quite unselfish viewpoint, he argues for the highest good of the Soviet Union. He may or may not be remonstrated with, strongly advised and urged to accept the new job tendered, but when the authorities feel that the man's mind is made up to decline to conform with a request (which means "disobey orders"), it acts, and acts quickly, without gloves. At midnight the dreaded G. P. U. come to the man's door and march him away; he is imprisoned, and, if such can possibly be arranged, is compelled to do the work as a convict that he declined to do as a supposedly unfettered citizen. Many a drawing-board in Soviet Russia is working overtime and under great pressure—in jail.

An American resident at Kharkov says, "It is common knowledge on the part of all Americans who are employed by the Soviet Coal Trust that for the past two years this very type of subversive

prison labor has been going on. Russian engineers, who work side by side with Americans, day after day mysteriously disappear, one by one. Then come rumors that So-and-So is confined to this prison, So-and-So to that; still bending over a drawing-board, still furnishing engineering designs, but with no salary," and we are further told that the Communist government of Soviet Russia has inaugurated a very interesting penal system. "Its new-style prisons, called 'houses of forced work,' receive much commendatory attention from foreign visitors. But these week-end jails, all spick-and-span, and modern in every detail, are only for the murderers, the pickpockets, the drunkards of the new Russia; not for those poor wretches who have deserted their jobs or who are accused of counter-revolutionary activities. The Czarist dungeons are still good enough for them, and they are filled to capacity."

If the Soviet Union incarcerates a man whose work—particularly along technical lines—they need, they will see that he is fed enough to sustain life in order that they obtain the needed output from his brain, but if an imprisoned victim is unimportant and just an ordinary man "without a sense of social responsibility toward the reconstruction of his country," he receives no food and no bedding from the State, and unless he has a family or friends who learn of his plight and who sacrifice themselves to keep him alive, he will die. If a man, after being subjected to the cruel inquisition of the G. P. U., is considered a "harmer" or a "counter-revolutionist," he is apt to be shot; if he is declared guilty of cherishing an "alien ideology," bourgeois and capital-

istic, and is convicted of being anti-Soviet, he is apt to be exiled and transported to Siberia or elsewhere—banished to the most inhospitable wastes,—with little or no hope or chance for return, or for many months or years of life. Russians charged with speculation and other economic offenses and what they term “political prisoners” are apt to find themselves on the dreaded Solovyetzky Island in the White Sea—“The Island of the Damned.”

Available statistics show that during the last decade of the nineteenth century the number of Russians exiled to Siberia averaged about 20,000 per year; from 1873 to 1877 the exiles averaged 18,250, annually, and from 1823 to 1887, inclusive, the average was about 12,000. (During the last twenty-five years of the Czarist régime, it is estimated, from records, that some 25,000 prisoners were exiled per year, and it is said by investigators that the Soviet Union has removed from their homes by force, and banished, one million souls per year during recent years, i.e., forty times as many as the despotism that they have supplanted.) Paul Miliukoff, in “Russia and its Crisis,” puts the number of exiles, following the revolution of 1905—a period of great unrest, repression, agitation and terrorism—then living under sentence of banishment in Siberia, at 60,000, but whereas it has been well said that “the bloodiest of the Czars had qualms against exterminating (or liquidating) five million Kulaks with one wave of the hand, Dictator Stalin has none.”

Russia has been experiencing what might be called “the greatest turnover of labor in history.” Men, whether viewed by the dictatorship at the

Kremlin in Moscow as devils or angels, beasts or a creation made "in the image of God," and whether considered as animated machines, robots, or mere "cannon fodder" of the industrialization of a New Russia, must eat to live, and "self-preservation is the first law of nature." The food and general living conditions in Soviet Russia have recently been so bad that labor in many locations have collapsed at work through physical weakness; other workers have "bearded the Communist lion in his den" and have walked out on their jobs, with only one thought in mind—to get some food somehow, somewhere, in order to sustain life. Such men are never treated humanly and with leniency; it is decreed that they have failed to stand a test; that they are not "for" but "against" Communism; that their actions show they have bourgeois minds (and stomachs) and counter-revolutionary leanings; therefore, they must be punished, and their punishment capitalized and made a warning to all others who might gravitate to similar weakness and thoughtlessness.

The Russian is not free in any sense of the word he has merely changed masters, passing in serfdom from one vacillating, aristocratic overlord to a still more autocratic, unscrupulous, despotic dictator, who refuses to hesitate or side-step, listen, or feel in the onward rush, with "blood and iron," to his objective of absolutism. A Russian, if "Red" and housed—even on a very low plane of living that is bare sustenance, and void of all comforts or even of what in our civilization and degree of culture we designate as decency,—can be expected to work and slave for his master, but when food is not forth-

coming, when starvation looks his family and himself in the face, he, like any other human being or animal, will act and move to find food, and go where he thinks it can be obtained. It is well enough for the dictator to order the workers' belts taken up another notch or two, to demand more work and more self-sacrifice, with its associated suffering, but the human stomach must be fed, and the Russian workman likes a good, square meal, just as much as his German, British, French, or American brother. When acute food shortages developed in the Donbas coal region, in the Urals, and in several thickly populated or developing industrial centers, Russian workmen, actuated by a spirit of self-preservation, very sensibly dropped their tools, defied their bosses, and started to hunt for food or a job that would bring them needed food as a reward. No man can do heavy, laborious work without solid food, yet for months the Communist dictatorship in Russia fed their hard-working serfs but cabbage soup and black bread, and when their instinctive animal nature rebelled—their souls being long ago numbed—they became deserters, to be hunted down and punished, deprived of trade-union cards and outlawed or terrorized into submission—with penalties.

The labor turnover, in violation of all the decrees, arbitrary force, espionage and terrorism of the Communist dictator, became so great in Russia that the much-heralded Five-Year Plan seemed doomed. Then began the great propaganda drive and appeal to the proletariat, the peasant, the humble, lowly and ignorant. The Communist youth (both young men and girls) were mobilized and used for "drives"

on certain "fronts," as reinforcements at "weak sectors" and as "shock" or "relief" troops; days of rest and the decreed hours of labor were ignored—as they often are. Every one must help. Impassioned speakers rushed from meeting to meeting, and from point to point, all over the country; newspapers, placards and posters blazed their screaming messages; the silver screen and "talkie," the radio, and every means of publicity were conscripted for service to appeal to and intimidate the rank and file of the Russian proletarian- and peasant-drafted army. "Those who are not with us are against us. Every loyal person, every one of the toiling masses must play his active part in the social reconstruction of the country that belongs to the workers and peasants! Every one must stick to the ranks!" Every one should, and every one must, not only put his shoulder to the wheel, but push, and keep on pushing—no matter how much it hurts.

The "emancipated" women soon found that what they thought would mean freedom and liberation, actually meant the loss of all female-sex privileges and exemptions and the assumption of an "equality" that lowered women to the level of male serfs and beasts of burden. For special construction and development work, for the getting in of harvests, and to fill some of the shortage of labor resulting from the extermination or liquidation of the Kulaks, women were drafted from domesticity by a house-to-house canvas; suitability for performing certain work and the physical or mental condition of a woman were not deemed of importance. The G. P. U. acted when persuasion and force were needed; suffering was intensified and the death toll increased. Orders were given to mobilize office and

factory employees to work, with no compensation whatsoever, on their free days at jobs such as laying brick on new construction work or taking in a harvest, and all these proletarians and trade-union men knew better than to object. It is said that they "freely donated" their free-day time, and worked overtime daily for "the good of the cause." Eve Garrette Grady, in the capital of Ukraine—an industrial coal and agricultural center—writes, "I have frequently had the experience of watching bookkeepers, clerks, stenographers, draftsmen—even professors from the University of Kharkov, a venerable and once highly-important institution of learning—men and women who worked throughout the week in an office, a schoolroom, or a factory—briskly engaged in laying bricks at Tractorstroy on their free day. Refuse to go, they dared not. But those whom I knew used to smile ruefully, albeit quite furtively, as I passed, and hold up their white, office worker's or scholar's hands—all torn and scarred and bleeding."

A stern and inflexible decree was issued by the Commissariat of Labor, threatening all who left their assigned jobs before the completion of the Five-Year Plan with the severe punishment of being arbitrarily and automatically "struck off the employment register"; and this without regard to reasons or alibis advanced, and without regard to person, past record, ancestry, or affiliations. According to a decree of the Supreme Court of Russia, any attempt to entice a Russian worker from his job will be considered a criminal offense. The court fixed the punishment for this "crime" at three years in prison. We are further told that "in order to

impress upon the people the fact that it meant business, for several months *Pravda* (Truth) and *Izvestia* (News)—the two prime official newspapers and organs for authoritative propaganda—bristled with accounts of this deserter who was shot for walking off the job and that slacker who was jailed for ‘slowing up production.’ ” These general conditions exist to this day.

Russia has become a mammoth business corporation. It is capitalistic, in a vicious sense, and atavistic, being void of all consideration for, or even interest in, its human workers. Russia is the largest industrial and agricultural institution in the world; it has not advanced and progressed to a new, just and liberal level, but has gravitated and degenerated to slave and forced labor, void of freedom, equity, humanity and honor. The United States, Germany, Britain, Italy, France, to a degree, and other countries, with machinery, brains, and, in some cases, money and credits, are promoting, encouraging and developing this great business institution of the Communist Soviet Union, which has been planned and is being operated to ultimately destroy all so-called capitalistic nations—democratic peoples and free labor.

Two or three years ago Russia was pathetically backward, both as an industrial and as an agricultural nation. To-day it is a people at war; thinking war, planning war, making war in an economic sense, with a militaristic organization and discipline, speaking the language of war, and scheming and acting with all the intolerance and inhumanity of war. Russia is at war, fighting “a five-year battle against her own backwardness.” All her resources

and all her working or fighting powers have been conscripted, and have been or are being mobilized in a "win the war" spirit; essentially ignorant and full of bunk and ballyhoo—but no worse in this respect than the hysterical, authoritatively-inspired propaganda campaigns that emotionally curse at times democratic and supposedly more intelligent peoples. General Haskell says, "The sacrifices that the people are making for her success stagger the imagination and are probably greater—in percentage of national income involved and in hardships endured—than those made by any nation in the World War."

Any success that the Soviets obtain from their Five-Year Plan will come from the aid furnished them by the most highly developed non-communistic states in the world—with the United States in the vanguard. America and Russia are two opposite poles. They are not only different; they are hostile. If one exists, the other is doomed. Yet Russia, to make her ambitious industrialization plan successful, has to buy machines and equipment from, and hire men, produced, trained and developed under, the capitalistic system that she condemns. The Soviets will not permit conditions to exist in Russia that produced these wonderful machines and these wonderful "free" men—with initiative and inventive, or executive, genius—yet they think that, in transplanting machines and having them set up and operated, they do not have to transplant the industrial genius of democratic and free America that produced the machines and is now engaged in the United States in producing still better ones. It has been well said, "If Russia were

trying to make an imperial bureaucracy work on its own resources it would be testing out its own doctrines. It drafts the brains of its enemy to prove that the enemy is wrong. The comic spirit should take note of this." The Russians have not advanced; they have gone backward, and have merely exchanged one contemptible form of vassalage for a still worse one. They actually enjoy far less freedom under Communism than they did under Czarism. Communism is vicious and knavish, or fraudulent, serfdom. Capitalism is opportunity, with freedom; and progress comes only from the genius and initiative of the individual, which world-moving qualities germinate only in an atmosphere of legitimate and unrestrained human liberty.

The Five-Year Plan is a grandiose program for the industrialization of Russia, "for the establishment of the foundation of a Communist order and for the creation of a solid point of support for the World Revolution." The Communist Party and the Soviet Government are determined that the Plan shall be developed and accomplished without any regard whatsoever to the will of the people or to the suffering or privation which the Plan entails to an amazing and unprecedented degree.

The Five-Year Plan of the Russian Communists, launched in October, 1928 (eleven years after the revolution), is a religion; in effect it is a grand effort for the industrialization of Russia, as far as explanation to the foreigner is concerned, but it is a supreme effort to attain the economic and military independence of Russia as far as the Russian scheming mind is concerned. Five years ago a machine in Russia was a mystery; now it is an idol. A machine

mania has taken hold of the small amount of imagination which has survived, in the humble Russian soul, the oppression and repression of centuries. The god of Russia to-day is the machine—manifested in its greatest perfection by the products of American skill. The Russian artisan and peasant, notwithstanding all the bombastic Communist harangues of the dictator and his authoritative propaganda, look to the United States as a people whom the machine has made prosperous and has given to its creators and its users unheard-of blessings, such as food in abundance, wonderful weather-proof, durable, healthful homes, with privileges, pleasures and comforts beyond words, and luxuries beyond thought itself. The ideal of the workers in communistic Russia is to some day emerge from their wanderings in the wilderness—with its sacrifices, hardships and sorrows—and reach the Promised Land of the dictators, which they all picture as a Zion that will give them, at least approximately, a standard of living such as the American worker enjoys—thanks to the wonderful American machine, which they are growing, more and more, to revere and worship.

Russia's reverence for the machine to-day comes from the fountainhead of power. A worker is used and exploited. A machine must be tenderly guarded and operated. A human life, by official decree, is of less importance than that of a machine. Dreadful penalties are imposed upon poor and ignorant peasants, whose knowledge of machinery is nil, for "wanton cruelty" to machines—including tractors. Carelessness or indifference, resulting in injury to mechanism, is a crime. Sabotage is death. But the

Communist dictatorship, with its adoration of the Five-Year Plan, is at least consistent, and a Russian engineer found guilty of making a mathematical miscalculation or an error in design, or a Russian builder who underestimates stresses, uses faulty material and erects a defective structure, is subject to punishment, ranging from a jail sentence to death—the extent or harshness of the verdict depending upon the money loss, due to the error, and whether “the psychology of the moment” suggests that a stern example be made of the unfortunate or careless man.

All labor in Russia is “forced”; it positively is not free in any sense of the word, and, if not free, it must, by the very nature of things, be coerced or compelled by governing, regulating and controlling power. In Russia, a man or woman (and children of proclaimed working age—14 years, if not of student bent) must work as directed by a despotic dictator and his arbitrary and autocratic organization, or starve. There is no doubt about this officially-decreed policy, and the communist “Red” revolutionists will tolerate no nonsense about their creed and utilization of what is essentially and unquestionably “forced labor.” “Work or starve” is the Soviet method of ruling a nation. Henry Wales, newspaper correspondent, after completing a fifteen-thousand-mile tour of Russia says, “Men and women are placed in front of a given task and told to perform or starve; they are prevented from going elsewhere to earn their living, and if that is forced labor, then all Russia is one huge concentration camp of forced labor. . . . Theoretically, and by decree, every man and working woman in the coun-

try is nailed to the job he holds and cannot change or move elsewhere without written permission. Railway men, coal-miners and factory workers, manufacturing labor of any and all kinds, lumberjacks, textile employees and peasants are thus mobilized. Due to this slave-driving and controlled method, it requires from five to ten times as many men on a job as are needed otherwise, which in one way accounts for Russia's ability to boast of no unemployment. If the spirit of wilful accomplishment and the ability to earn more were in sight, the worker would do more; then possibly even Russia would be experiencing unemployment as other nations are."

William B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor in President Wilson's cabinet, recently expressed his strong opposition to Socialism and Communism. "There are those who believe the remedy for our economic ills and unemployment ills to be the Russian type of Communism, but the remedy is worse than the disease," said the champion of labor, "and," he continued, "Russian leaders maintain in their propaganda that the 'capitalistic world' (the rest of the world) is in the throes of a disastrous unemployment situation, while there is no unemployment in Russia. Any man conversant with the development of human society knows that slaves are never unemployed, and the people of Russia are slaves of the State. The greatest flaw in Communism is that the State owns everything; there is but one employer. Any one unwilling to accept the conditions imposed by this one employer finds himself unable to get food and other necessities of life. That is forced labor—slavery," and, again, "Secret police

assist in the complete oppression of the Russian laborer; people are convicted without trial and are shot or moved out into the forests and mines. The only equality in Russia is an equality of black bread and coffee, a bare subsistence. . . . Any farmer making \$300 in one year is rich and is sent to forests and mines." (This is termed "liquidation of the Kulaks" or "rich" peasants.) And, he adds, "I cannot conceive of men giving up all their personal liberty, suppressing all of their national impulses and desires for all time, even if Russia should develop enough industry to bring about higher standards of living. Russia is about 400 years behind the rest of the world in social development, and ultimately the yoke will be thrown off."

State capitalism of the Russian communist brand is far more vicious than the worst, most brutal and most oppressive form of private, crude and unmellowed capitalism. Private ownership of land and factories means many owners in a capitalistic land, and the more employers of labor, the more factories, farms, timber holdings, mines, etc., the more competition exists, which reacts to the benefit of the worker who desires to sell his time and services. A condition which results in many employers desiring and bidding for a workman's services is good, in an economic sense, for the worker. On the other hand, only one employer, with many workers desiring jobs, results in economic and autocratic power lodging with the single employer to the positive disadvantage and economic detriment of the many employees. In Russia, all industry and all the fields of human activity are owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a government that is not

affected by "parties," that has, and can have, no legislative or operating opposition, that is controlled by a despot and is able to impose its will upon all its workers and upon all its people. The Soviet Communists freely admit that their government is a dictatorship, but they say that it is a class dictatorship. This is untrue. The Communist Party, representing $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., or less, of the population, is the theoretical dictator. The actual dictator is Stalin; he controls the Party, the trade unions and the so-called proletarians, but whether one person, or one per cent. of the inhabitants of Russia, dominates and controls the entire people, it is evident that when and where such dictatorship by one, or a few functioning as one unit, exists, there can be no individual freedom. Dictatorship means the exercise of absolute and supreme authority on the part of the one, or of a few—organized and operating as one—over the many and the all. A dictatorship with respect to the domination of labor—admitted by the Soviets—means, in plain language, "forced labor"; it is and can mean nothing else.

Forced labor is not necessarily convict labor, i.e., the labor of malefactors or felons, convicted and under sentence for the committing of a crime. A prison is not restricted or limited to four walls or a relatively small, barricaded enclosure, but it is a place, whether that place be a building, a city, a country, or a continent, where persons are confined and restrained of liberty. Prison labor is forced labor, as it is compulsory and is demanded and obtained by the exercise of external and authoritative power. Russia is a prison camp and a country

where the population and workers are prisoners and are deprived of liberty. A prisoner cannot, when and as he desires, leave a jail where he is incarcerated; neither can a Russian leave the Soviet Union, his village, town, district, or even his job. A Russian is a prisoner in every sense of the word, and the extent of his relative and apparent freedom and his scope for movement or sphere of activity depend entirely upon conditions imposed by his jailer, his personal pedigree and record, and his standing with "the powers that be." Authoritative investigators and eye-witnesses can give abundant testimony to the existence of all sorts and degrees of convict labor and of declassed and exiled wretches in Russia who seek the privilege of work for food.

Almost unbelievable numbers of starving people strain beneath the slave-driver's lash in the timber forests of the Siberian Northland and elsewhere. Charles Powell, an Indiana engineer, after a year in Russia says, "Prison labor is not confined to the northern districts or to the timber and lumber industry around Soliskamsk." He has seen such convict labor "used in the salt brine and soda industry, in railway and highway building, and on other construction work," and he affirms that "Russia is trying to eliminate older people because they are not fully in sympathy with Communism. Convict labor is the Soviet way of getting rid of the older class, men and women alike. The Reds put them to work and get as much out of them as they can before the unfortunate prisoners die from overwork, starvation, or exposure." Many of these convict laborers are farmers who have committed the crime of being successful enough, in a competitive world, to own a

plot of ground, a hut, a horse and cow, and possibly a few chickens—therefore they are declared to be capitalistic and anti-communist. "Any one who has had enough initiative to accumulate anything is eligible to be condemned to convict labor—farmers, storekeepers, physicians, lawyers, merchants, bankers, etc. There is never any trouble in finding a charge. These are the types of persons who are termed convicts and whose work under cruel compulsion is termed convict labor." It has been contended by certain pro-communists that such labor is not forced. Of course, no man has to work if he is determined not to do so. But if he wants to eat and live he is compelled to work exactly when, where, and as directed and decreed—this is assuredly forced labor; if he attempts to escape he will either starve or be shot in the back. A prisoner in a cell may go on a hunger strike, but this does not alter the fact that he is deprived of liberty; a man may claim that no one can force him to work, but that does not alter the fact that if he eats and lives he must work when, where, and as ordered—therefore, to live, he becomes a victim of forced labor. Powell further says, "During ten consecutive days in February, I saw six groups of convict laborers sent up the river from Soliskamsk under armed guards. I would estimate that there were from 600 to 1000 persons in each group. During this period I was in town only once each day, and never for more than an hour at a time. . . . If these old men and women can't stand the work in the camps on the small amount of bad food given them, they die and that's the end of it, for the Communists wish to be rid of

them. I've seen thousands of convicts go up the river, but I've never seen one return."

No drafted or conscripted labor is free and, in Russia, every person, man, woman, or child is subject to conscription to fill the labor ranks. This is forced labor. In times of war most "capitalistic" nations draft their young-man power to form armies for military purposes. Russia drafts all its population, over some fourteen years of age, for its industrial and military armies, and further insists upon the education of all the children, so that their minds are early prepared for the slavery that awaits them. Russia is at war; the lower class of the proletariat—communist-led—has all other classes by the throat and seeks to either enslave or exterminate them; this is a state of civil war, or class war, in which victory at the moment rests with the bloodiest and most unscrupulous, armed and organized. Are the vast and overwhelming numerical majority of Russians forced to submit to this tyranny of blood, iron and terrorism? They are. Are they compelled or forced to work as directed, without choice of freedom? They most positively are, if they desire to live. Is their labor free or forced? To this question there is and can be only one answer. All Russian labor is positively and indisputably forced, no matter what our American parlor socialists and radical nincompoops, our political opportunists, retrogressive progressives and pseudoeconomists, or our essentially selfish industrialists and bankers of international interests and sympathies may say—some of whom seem to be willing in their stupid ignorance, thoughtlessness, or short-sightedness to sell their Lord and country,

like Judas, for some thirty pieces of contemptible silver. Conscripted labor is not voluntary, but is that which is enrolled or acquired by compulsion; there is no freedom in compulsion. Conscripted labor is forced labor. Drafted labor is not voluntary, but is that which is claimed or demanded, selected and utilized by authority; there can be no freedom of labor where despotism of any nature can claim or arbitrarily demand the work and service of men and women, and punish or penalize for non-compliance. Drafted labor is forced labor.

The United States Tariff Act of 1930, which, as Public Law No. 361, is stated to be "An Act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes," contains the following provision (Section 307), which was definitely inserted to protect American labor and American industries from convict, conscripted and forced labor, such as is used to-day entirely throughout the domain of the so-called Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics (which consists of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic, the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic, the White Russian Socialist Soviet Republic, the Trans-Caucasian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic and the two Central Asian Republics of Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan):

"All goods, wares, articles and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part in any foreign country by convict labor or/and forced labor or/and indentured labor under penal sanctions shall not be entitled to entry at any of the ports of the United States, and the importation

thereof is hereby prohibited, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of this provision. The provisions of this section relating to goods, wares, articles, and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured by forced labor or/and indentured labor shall take effect on January 1st, 1932; but in no case shall such provisions be applicable to goods, wares, articles, or merchandise so mined, produced, or manufactured which are not mined, produced, or manufactured in such quantities in the United States as to meet the consumptive demands of the United States.

“‘Forced Labor,’ as herein used, shall mean all work or service which is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty for its non-performance and for which the worker does not offer himself voluntarily.”

Forced labor is clearly and reasonably defined as that labor for which one does not voluntarily offer oneself and for the non-performance of which there is a penalty. If labor is free, as in any democratic country to-day, a person has the right to accept or decline a job; as far as competition and the unhampered operation of the law of supply and demand permit, he has the right of a choice of work—both as to nature and location; he has a right of bargaining as to rate of wages or “pay” and to demand, and stand for, fair compensation, reasonable hours of employment, hours for recreation and days of rest, and an aggregate weekly or monthly return that permits of the establishment and maintenance of a reasonable plane of living; he has the

right to organize with his fellows, if necessary, to obtain economic justice.

In Russia, no labor has such rights, for none is free. The Communists in power, operating under an absolute and unscrupulous dictatorship, control and rule the trade unions, which they themselves formed after the revolution, and all the proletarians or manual workers who are dominated and subjected to compulsion as conscripted labor under army discipline; the less fortunate peasant labor are in more evident bondage and suffer from an arbitrary and absolute subjugation, which is not only serfdom, but economic, social and political slavery.

Labor in Russia has no freedom of will and is given "no choice." Work is a universal obligation, without distinction of sex. Non-workers are not only disfranchised, but they are condemned to starvation. To eat and have shelter (even if one has to stand in line for food and be one of six or even fifteen persons in one room) means that one must not only work, but work when, where, and as directed by arbitrary authority (from the dictates of which there is no redress), and at the job and during the hours as prescribed, without deviation. To object or demur is treason; to refuse means exile (a slow death) or capital punishment—which, being quicker, is by far the better method of enforced exit from this world.

One of the Soviet Government's latest slogans, spread through the Union, posted and memorized, and popularly known as dedicated to the success of the Five-Year Plan, is, "Hail Hard Discipline in Labor." Discipline is hard and it couldn't be made any harder in Russia, for it is slavery. The slogan

might just as truly read, "Hail the chains that en-fetter Labor," or "Hail imprisonment with hard labor."

Marx's definition of the proletarian as the man with nothing to lose but his chains, applies with peculiar force to Russian labor to-day, where servitude is enforced by propaganda, permeated with falseness and deceit, by ever-present demonstrations of ruthless power, and by inhuman terrorism. The Russian worker, industrial or agricultural, has nothing to lose; he owns nothing whatsoever; but his food will not be forthcoming if he struggles to free himself, stops work, or changes his job and domicile. He is no more free than the slaves on our Southern plantations prior to the Civil War—and he is not nearly so well treated or so well fed and housed.

There is only one employer of labor in Russia, only one real merchant and distributor, one business institution, one importer and one exporter. All the power of employing and handling labor, buying and selling goods, rationing supplies, etc., rests with the Communist Party and its despotic dictator. There is no competition for the hiring of labor. The power in control arbitrarily says, "Do what we say; take it or leave it." There is no alternative. The whole nation is in the hands of a big monopolistic Trust that has killed off all competition—political, economic, social, religious and educational. There is no line of industry, no agricultural activity, no operation in forest or mine, in, on, or above the ground, and no human endeavor in Soviet Russia where there is not forced labor. All education is forced; there is no choice of reading,

and all "movies" and "talkies," radio, newspapers, placards, etc., are censored and authoritatively inspired. Men, women and children are compelled by force to do what they are told, when, where, and as they are told to do it. The Communists have the force and the brutal strength to impose obedience on the entire Russian people; the power which is ever present or hovering near to persuade and coerce, augmented by the dread of the G. P. U. with its terrorism, which threatens all—Party, trade unionists, proletarians, peasants, the declassed, disfranchised and the "people who were"; none is immune; none can escape; none is free.

The Commissariat of Labor of the Soviet Union has recently announced (April, 1931) that the Udarniki or "strivers," who are those workers who agree to work overtime and on rest days or holidays for nothing, will be granted extra food rations, but the pronouncement also states that those workers who do not do their work at an outlined speed, or with a stated output, are to have their food rations cut down. "Strivers" are not necessarily volunteers, however, as is claimed, but they are forced into this class or position because of "policy" and self-preservation. All sorts of trouble, even to disfranchisement and exile as a "counter-revolutionist," would follow if a worker did not "take the hint" gracefully, when and as advanced by his masters, and prove, by his self-sacrificing toil and a prompt and seemingly enthusiastic response to a call for extra effort, that he desired to see the Five-Year Plan made an unquestioned success.

Eve Garrette Grady, who has said "One may unqualifiedly state that there is no line of indus-

try, no human endeavor in Soviet Russia to-day in which there is not forced labor," tells of the Americans, engaged as consultants in the Soviet Coal Trust, receiving a request from the Bolshevik authorities in February, 1931, to sign a carefully worded and prepared statement for their signature to the effect that "there is no forced labor in Soviet Russia." It appears that as the United States, Great Britain, Canada, France, and certain other progressive countries were considering ways and means of protecting their home labor from "forced" or "conscripted" and "convict" competition, the Communists were getting their counter-propaganda material together and wanted to be prepared, by prejudicial testimony and carefully organized "lies," to refute all accusations which would, as a matter of fact, clearly describe the actual state of affairs and the conditions of servitude existing. We are told that the request for the American mining engineers' signatures was "a smoothly-worded invitation," but with that ever-prevalent "Remember, we can break your contract" threat clearly visible between the lines. It is gratifying to know that this one body of Americans brusquely refused to sign the document, saying that their presence in Russia was for business reasons only and that they did not care to become involved in the country's politics. However, Mrs. Grady tells us that some time afterwards she saw in the *Moscow News* a long statement signed by a number of Americans engaged in various industries, stating flatly that there was no forced labor in the Soviet Union. We are told that "it was played up prominently in the paper, under the interesting

caption, 'This unsolicited statement from American specialists,' " etc. The mining engineers at Khar-kov, having seen that "unsolicited statement" before, must have felt ashamed of their compatriots and of the Soviet Union. It is amazing that selfishness will both blind and numb the brain and moral sense of a professional man, as well as of a capitalist; both, at times, shut their eyes and ears and lean toward the magnetized "almighty" dollar. It is to be expected that the clever and unscrupulous Soviets have seen that the false statements of prejudiced or grossly ignorant American engineers, who being directly or indirectly "bought and paid for" apparently sensed "which side their bread was buttered on," have been forwarded where they will do the most good for the Soviets and the most harm to the United States and all of its citizens. Any man who functions as a Benedict Arnold is a traitor to his country, even though he is innocent of intentional wrong-doing and is merely susceptible to plausible, but false, propaganda. Harm and injury are hurtful and possibly ruinous, no matter if the motive were merely thoughtless, unintelligent and unintentional. "The Soviet Government," says Mrs. Grady, "holds the people of Russia in the hollow of its hand. It pulls the strings and they dance. It tells them where to work; and if they refuse, it exacts a penalty. Yet every time the subject of forced labor is mentioned abroad, there are shrieks of rage and shouts of fury. In fact, even as I write, I can hear the Bolsheviki crying from the housetops: 'You are telling capitalistic lies—capitalistic lies!'"

The American Federation of Labor, it is said,

are taking the very definite, patriotic and essentially human stand that the entire Soviet Economic System is based on convict, forced, or indentured labor, and that to permit the products of such a system to come into this country, where labor is free, is to undermine the entire foundation of society. Much labor in Russia is convict labor, but all labor of every type and nature, industrial or agricultural, in every part of the Soviet Union, is "forced labor" as defined by our national law. All labor in Russia is exacted from the workers under the menace of a penalty for its non-performance, and no worker enjoys the freedom or privilege of offering himself voluntarily for a job, of choice in his work—nature or location,—or of the right to bargain for his services.

James W. Gerard, referring to the wages paid Russian labor by the Soviet Union, says, "There is a certain proportion of labor—no one knows how large—that receives no money at all—merely food and lodging. That class is made up largely of political criminals—persons who have lifted their voices in protest against the present régime. It also comprises a considerable number of farmers who tried to operate as individuals and ran afoul of Soviet dictates. There are several other classes of workers, laboring under various restrictions and receiving different levels of low or nominal pay. It is probably fair to say, however, that the general average of wages is about enough to permit the laborer to keep body and soul together; enough to buy at the government stores a little sour black bread, a little cabbage soup, a bit of fish as a day's rations. Perhaps once in a while the worker can

afford an ounce of butter, or an egg, or a small portion of meat (generally horse flesh)—provided they are available. It is difficult for us to believe that such a condition can exist. But it does. This is not theory; it is fact. The Russian Government has under its control all the natural resources of the country—for which it paid nothing. It simply confiscated them. It owns all the land, the mines, the timber, and all the mills and factories for converting raw material into finished products. It owns all railroads, transportation and distributing facilities—virtually everything in the country. It has all the labor it wants—at the lowest possible wage level. And it takes most of those wages right back by exercising a monopoly on practically everything the wage-earner has to buy; for the worker, in order to live, has to spend his wages in government stores, paying whatever the government cares to charge. Any one who does not work for the State cannot buy goods in the government stores at all. Soviet Russia has an absolute and thorough control of both its capital and its labor.”

Russian Soviet statistics—which should always be viewed as “colored” to conform to the needs and desires of the moment and to be effective as either propaganda or a stimulus—tell us that in 1929 there were some eighty-five million persons of working age in the Soviet Union, of which the proletarian element of some nine and one-half million persons represented about 11 per cent., or one “proletarian” out of every nine persons of working age. Of the nine and one-half million proletariat, only three and one-quarter million (34 per cent.) were employed in the industries, and, of these, only 87

per cent. were manual laborers and artisans, and 13 per cent. were of the somewhat despised "white collar" brigade.

The Communist Party have decreed that no Russian labor or trade union will authorize or declare a strike. The G. P. U. agents and the influence of the Communists and young Communists in the labor unions are an effective bar to the development of any strike movement among the workers. It should, moreover, be kept in mind that if any individual worker should attempt to organize a strike he would be immediately arrested by the G. P. U. and charged with and severely punished for "counter-revolutionary" activity. There is no freedom or democracy in a Russian labor union. The members are all completely subservient to the Communist Party, and the Party is positively and openly opposed to the American ideal of industrial democracy. Labor unions throughout Soviet Russia are merely the tools of the Party.

There are said to be twenty-three labor, or trade, unions in Russia, with a membership made up of about 73 per cent. males and 27 per cent. females, but even trade-union labor in Russia is not equal, and class differentiation permeates the so-called solidarity of the proletariat. A white collar worker—called not a worker, but an employee—thoroughly unionized and an apparently ardent conformer to the doctrine and dictates of Communism, is considered and treated but little better at times, and under certain conditions, than one of the "deprived" class who is openly branded as an enemy of the Soviet State. All Union Labor that do not work with their hands and are not considered by the manual workers

as toilers—who produce by the “sweat of the brow,” by muscle and back-bending, in factories and shops (not in fields)—are termed *Sluzhashchii*. Such proletariat have practically no standing and no power. The “white collar” is deemed a symbol of the old aristocratic and bourgeois régime; it is a symbol of education and of “soft” culture, and such is tolerated only because it is needed, and much humiliation and oppression are associated with their official recognition. The manual worker trade unions have members known as *Rabochii*, and these are the backbone of the revolutionary proletariat, with the Communist Party members of the proletariat domiciled therein forming the spinal column. If one is to fare well in Russia, his ambition is to be a *Rabochii* and a member of this aristocracy of labor, which is the privileged class. There is a Code of Labor in Soviet Russia, dealing with hours of labor, regulations as to overtime, etc., but in an emergency (and such are of frequent occurrence) the Code means but little. The Communist Party holds the labor unions responsible for productivity. The Five-Year Plan is very exacting. Workers, at times, have to donate their free days and free hours of working days to the cause. The official *Izvestia* (Feb. 9, 1930) tells of the workers of the electro-mechanical department of Dneprostroy toiling continuously for two full days, without leaving the factory; the paper said that the men, during this period, did not sleep or rest, and did not smoke a single cigarette.

The labor unions in Russia, seemingly strong and dominant on the surface and “in print,” would disgust the free-born and freethinking American or British labor unionist. Everything in a Russian trade union is so “cut and dried,” so definitely ar-

ranged by Communist authorities, that membership in a union—so far as an individual worker having any influence or even of having anything to say—is a cruel joke. The situation is analogous to giving a worker clothes and not letting him wear them; food, and not letting him eat, and then telling him and announcing to the world that he is well clothed and fed. The result is that the members of the Soviet labor unions have become antipathetic, shirk attendance at the meetings, and call them a nuisance and a bore. During the last few years force has had to be exerted by the authorities in control to compel members on certain occasions to attend the so-called important meetings of the unions.

It is amusing to see the slogan "One for all, and all for one" used so frequently in Russia. Even the Communists are more stupid than generally considered, or they must have a subtle sense of humor. The Communist Party and the Soviet Union actually operate under a policy of, "Nothing for the many; all for a few." The proletarians steal from the peasants in the spirit of "All for us," but when it comes to the peasant wanting boots and clothes made by the proletarians, the response in actual operation is, "None for you." Yet Russia is called a worker's Republic, and Communists justify the use of the word "Republic" by saying that "a Republic is a state in which the sovereign power resides in a certain body of the people." Russia is no more a "Republic" than the United States would be if all the citizens were deprived of voice in the handling of affairs except one "certain body," say, the dentists of the country, or the morticians. Moreover, it cannot be a "workers' " Republic, for the word "workers" in reality has an exceedingly broad meaning, and all the labor

unions of Russia combined—the admitted and official workers—have not more than one-eighth of the registered, recorded, or known workers of the land enrolled as members; and all outside the unions, including the vast army of agricultural workers, are beyond the pale of standing and privilege. It is significant that the Communists, even officially and in propaganda, do not consider agricultural labor as “workers.” The only real acknowledged “worker” is the industrial or factory manual worker, and all trade unions are restricted to the urban population. The rural inhabitants of Russia, who number some eighty per cent. of the total population, are branded as of a more inferior order than the once low-caste proletarian and gutter fighter. The Communists themselves refer to the labor of Russia as “workers and peasants.” Even the proletarian workers inside the ring, who are favored with preference and considered as the élite, have a slogan of their own to add to the authoritatively-declared “Workers’ Republic”; they add, “Black Bread and Hard Work,” and when the G.P.U. are not around they add, “with little bread and much damned hard work.”

There are many excellent features of the Communist Labor Code, but even though the Code may seem to be a Magna Carta for the Soviet worker “on paper,” it does not always operate that way in actual practice. Regulations with respect to maximum hours of labor, working and rest days, overtime, the conditions of labor for women and children say one thing, but the Communist dictatorship may say another. Theoretically, a five-day week—with one day of rest, and a seven-hour day—is admirable for the workers; but when “stress of conditions” and frenzied propaganda, urging all to work

and sacrifice "to win the war" and to put over the Five-Year Plan, virtually compel men and women to work on their free days and to work overtime on ordinary work days; and when homes are searched and women and children are conscripted and forcibly put to work in order to cope with some existing condition of labor shortage—in the fields, mines, factories, or on new construction work,—then this Magna Carta becomes a mere scrap of paper, useful to the Soviets as foreign propaganda and "window-dressing," but useless as far as protection and the well-being of Russian labor are concerned. The official report previously referred to of men working in a sort of Communist religious frenzy for two days continuously, without any sleep or rest whatsoever, is a cogent illustration of what is happening and what may happen at any time under a system of propaganda-stimulated, forced labor.

The five-day week, most appealing on paper, has splendid advantages that, however, are materially lessened, and, in some respects, counterbalanced in actual operation. Ignoring the fact that free or rest days may prove to be work days (and that a five-day week, with one of the days a rest day, has great advantages and is most meritorious), it is evident that the system in effect, of every day being a working day in Russia, with no national day of rest each (five-day) week, and that all factories and all other operations—industrial, agricultural, forest, mines, etc.—run continuously, is a scheme on the part of the Communist dictatorship to eliminate all Sundays or religious days of worship, and break up home and family life—as well as to get more out of machinery and reduce non-productive overhead.

The atheistic Russian Communists were deter-

mined to kill the religious weekly rest day of the Christian, the Jew, and of certain other faiths whose Sabbaths did not come on the same day of the week. They could, like Turkey, have attempted to partially improve conditions by arbitrarily decreeing that one specified day out of seven would be the Soviet Union day of rest, and, by arbitrary force, make all other faiths and religious sects conform; they preferred, however, to go further, make "one bite of the cherry," and give all religions a solar-plexus blow by eliminating all Sundays, rest days, or holy days. They ridiculed the Jewish-Christian Bible story of God creating the world in six days and resting on the seventh day, calling the seventh day "Holy" and saying, according to Moses, "In it thou shalt do no manner of work." When Jehovah or Yahweh, or any other god comes in opposition with Communist economics, the god must go.

Five, not seven, is the mystical, allegorical, or emblematical number of the Communists. The reason is that five stands for the five continents of the world and for the five races of mankind (as outlined by Blumenbach). Communism is not Russian, but of the world, and every thought and act of the Communist Party is not national, but international.

The operation of the five-day week is more annoying than pleasing to the Russian worker. He would naturally like one day of rest in five, and if he gets it, as he should (in harmony with the provisions of the Labor Code), why does not his wife—who is also a worker,—or their children,—get the same day off, so they can spend it together? The Soviet Government, however, seems to deliberately and maliciously operate to prevent such pleasant things, and it is said that their prime object is to

break up, not only the Church, but the institution of the private home. There is a common saying in Russia among those who get a day off with fair regularity, "For four days some friends are looking for me and on the fifth I am looking for them; but it is hopeless—we never meet," and, in Moscow, among business people, there is a generally-repeated saying, "For four days I try to find some one else and on the fifth day every one tries to find me."

It is reported that the average wage in Russia (1929) in all branches of industry—subject, however, to arbitrary deductions by the authorities—was a little less than seventy rubles per month. On the basis of the Russian arbitrary and artificial, decreed foreign exchange, this is about \$8. per week in American money; on the basis of real value and buying power, it is very much less. As a matter of fact, the Russian ruble is a "three-in-one" creation. There is the foreigner's ruble, or "valuta ruble," of approximately 50 cents value (theoretical parity 1.943 rubles per U. S. dollar). There is a labor, or good communist, ruble with a lower value, which has a certain artificially held-up buying power in government stores when associated with workers' food and general purchase tickets and ration cards. There is still a third ruble of very low value which can be termed the bourgeois ruble, "the moldering remnant of a decaying system"; this is the token of private trade, is the only ruble which the "deprived" class can use, and it takes ten or twenty of these rubles to buy in the outside "free" market what one good communist ruble, in the hands of a proletarian, with his Trade Union membership, his Co-operative and Food Cards, will buy in the government stores.

It is reported that it is possible to buy Soviet rubles in Riga or Berlin at from one-quarter to one-half their nominal value, and in cities near the Soviet-Persian frontier at about one-fifth of the "official" stabilized value, as decreed by the State. Albert Muldavin, in "The Red Fog Lifts," states that he was accosted, leaving a Travel Bureau in Berlin (after buying a ticket to Moscow, via Poland), and offered five hundred rubles for one hundred dollars. The import and export of Soviet currency is forbidden by law. The variable value of the ruble is a great incentive to smuggling Soviet currency into Russia, but the risk is great. When offenders are caught, the death penalty is usually inflicted. It is of interest to note that whereas foreign currency is readily converted into Soviet currency at the Russian border, Soviet currency is not convertible into foreign currency under any circumstances. Eve Garrette Grady, reporting her personal experiences with the buying power of the ruble in Russia, says that Americans are hired to work in the Soviet Union, with a salary stated in dollars, but with as large a percentage of this salary as the Russian can get the American (generally absolutely ignorant of the currency fiasco) to accept, payable at certain stipulated periods, in rubles. She affirms that the American-owned ruble in the American colonies in Stalingrad, Moscow, Kharkov, Tomsk, Leningrad and Novo-Sibirsk is worth, not fifty cents, but eleven cents, and an American engineer signing a "gilt-edged" three-year contract at \$12,000 a year—with one-half of his salary payable in rubles—sees that he is actually receiving, not \$12,000, but only \$7,290.

A prominent American engineer in Russia, in-

censed at the way he and his colleagues have been and are being cheated by the Soviets, says that he would congratulate any foreigner, who, tied up with the Russians by an unfair contract, had the courage to smuggle rubles over the border. This man gives the purchasing value in Russia of the ruble in American hands as "no greater than fifteen cents," and he further states that the privileged individuals in Moscow are enjoying a private inflation of the ruble, which is secretly bought abroad for about eight cents. An American newspaper man says that he was given the opportunity in Moscow to buy rubles at the rate of twenty cents each—if considered as a confidential transaction, with certain strings attached.

George Seldes, in "Can These Things Be," says that "Russia is trying to cheat the world twice." The ruble was stabilized in Russia "after it had reached some thirty million to the dollar. The chervonetz, or new ruble, was issued at the price of old Czarist money, and the Soviets bragged that they had gone on a gold basis without the usual big loan from America," and, he adds, "To-day the actual worth of the chervonetz is 10 to 15 cents in Berlin, Riga, and elsewhere; in Russia, officially, the price is 50 cents par; but even in Russia . . . the wise boys can get six or seven, and sometimes ten, rubles for the dollar, and they need it; the cost of living is higher there than anywhere else." It is further said that Russian labor "is being paid with rubles worth one-fifth their market value while they are forced to produce market value goods and labor in exchange. When money is paid a worker it is inflated, but when the Soviet sells the worker any goods the prices are marked on a gold basis." The State im-

poverishes the people by a vast, unconscionable swindle, deliberately made to aid its Five-Year Plan.

Bruce C. Hopper, in "Pan-Sovietism"—Houghton Mifflin Company—(1931), says: "Soviet money is an interesting phenomenon. The State Bank, in 1922, issued chervontsi—ten-ruble notes—which are covered 25 per cent. by precious metals and foreign exchange and 75 per cent. by short-term bills. In 1924, the State Bank began to issue so-called treasury notes in 1-, 3- and 5-ruble denominations, which pass as legal tender, but are not redeemable in chervontsi. The limit of issue of these treasury notes was first fixed at 50 per cent. of the chervontsi bank-notes in circulation. In August, 1928, this limit was raised to 75 per cent.; in September, 1930, it was raised again to 100 per cent. The Soviet ruble is (arbitrarily) pegged at 1.94 to the dollar. For every dollar that it puts in its vaults, the State Bank, within the limit of the 25 per cent. cover, may issue 8 chervontsi rubles. Against these 8 rubles in bank-note form it can likewise issue 8 rubles in treasury notes. In this way one dollar is the cover for 16 rubles, which, at the State-Bank rate, ought to be worth about \$8. Putting one capitalist dollar in the hole and drawing out the par equivalent of \$8. in Communist money is a feat not to be treated lightly these hard times. There are now over two billion rubles in bank-notes in circulation, which permits two billion more in treasury notes, a total of four billion, which is an increase of two and one-half times in three years. Soviet officials deny that there is inflation on the grounds that the increasing commercial turnover within the country demands more

money and that the treasury notes are backed by the entire property of the State Economic System."

All Russian workers with food cards are not rationed alike. There are the Class A workers (which consist of Communists, G.P.U., Red Army officers, etc.), also Class B and Class C workers. The food books of Americans (employed as specialists to assist the Soviets in the prosecution of the Five-Year Plan) are for rations, we are told, that are generally the same as Class A, and when there is plenty the quantities rationed are moderate, but not liberal; when there is a shortage, the rationed supply per person is cut accordingly. In July, 1930, rations, because of food shortage in certain sections, were cut to one pound of butter, three pounds of sugar, five eggs, seven and a half pounds of bread, and fifteen quarts of milk (generally sour) per person per month. If more food was needed to sustain life, it had to be bought in the outside stores—a Soviet "hold-up" commercial scheme,—where the ruble has such a depreciated value, coupled with a real shortage of edible products, that, on the basis of American currency, butter was advanced from a spring price of one dollar per pound to over five dollars in the fall; eggs from eight cents to twenty cents each, and prices were raised to over thirty cents per pound for flour; one dollar per pound for very inferior meat, five dollars for a chicken, and, in September, 1930, sugar sold at one dollar and a quarter per pound. Americans, as well as Russian peasants, labor unionists and communists, were compelled to take in several notches in their belts—yet, at this time, Russian sugar, butter and other foodstuffs were being dumped abroad and were selling at ridiculously low prices, while Rus-

sians struggled to keep alive. The Communist dictator decreed that the Five-Year Plan must go forward and that sales of commodities abroad were imperative if money was to be forthcoming to buy machines to industrialize Russia. "The Communist Party is determined," it was said, "that the revolution shall not perish, even if some peasants starve."

Meat is scarce in Russia, but the enfettered workers should cheer up at the news that the Second Five-Year Plan, to be completed toward the close of 1938, expects to "materially lessen the prevailing shortage of meat, butter, cheese, and such other products," and it is said to provide (in some seven years from date) some "2 pounds of meat per person per week," or about 4½ ounces per day. Whether the meat is to be beef, mutton, or horse is not stated. Much of the meat consumed in Russia to-day is horse meat—and that in various stages of decomposition. The estimated quantity of meat to be available to all at the end of 1938 is, incidentally, what the manual worker and trade-union proletariat is supposed to obtain to-day—when it is available—with the "employee" (and a member of an accredited union, etc.) being eligible to receive, if he can get it, just half that amount. However, it is consoling to know that the present rations to workers provide for a little less than 10 ounces of herring per week for the manual worker and some 6½ ounces to the "employee"—provided there is any on hand.

Eliot Wadsworth, formerly an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and now member of an engineering firm, upon his recent return from Russia stated that it is difficult for an American mind to

grasp the whole power of Russian bureaucratic dictatorship, where the State is and owns everything and the individual is and owns nothing. "The ordinary rewards for work and skill do not exist. To have a home, with all it means, or to lay aside anything for the future, is forbidden. No industrial worker can get a job, a place to sleep, or the right to buy a quota of food and clothing except through a government agency. At co-operative stores a worker may buy bread daily at a modest price, and a quota of other food at certain intervals if the articles are in stock. Long lines wait patiently for hours to buy before the stocks are gone. . . . To have one of these workers' food cards is almost essential to keeping alive. . . . As owner of all the buildings, the Government is landlord to every resident of a city, allocating tenants to each room and collecting all rents." And, again, "No individual is free from the fear that suspicion may turn toward him and a penalty be applied without warning. This is parental government to the last degree, skilfully designed to enforce discipline."

"Russia, in so far as consumable goods are concerned, is certainly a seller's market," says Gen. W. N. Haskell (Chief of the American Relief Administration in Russia, 1921-23), commenting on conditions as he recently found them in Russia, "but the only seller is the Government. After rent is paid and card allowances are obtained, money means nothing. Almost no one gets enough to pay the high prices of the Government's 'open' or 'free' stores, where butter is \$3. a pound, and eggs (if any) are 50 cents apiece," and he adds that "if a worker should want to buy an alarm-clock it would cost him more than a whole month's wages, and a fountain

pen would cost \$50. These are luxuries." General Haskell is emphatic in his statement that the standard of living in Russia "has not improved in the last five years, either in the cities or on the farms." The Soviet Government operates with a "ruthless disregard of what the public wants," and the people are only allowed what the Government prescribes, and nothing more, whether it be shelter, food, or clothing. Comforts and "margins over essentials" are not now for the Russians, who are called upon to make heavy sacrifices "so that the utmost may be exported, to pay Russia's foreign bills for materials, machines and skilled labor, that are indispensable for completing the plan for industrialization." As the Government fixes all wages and all prices, rations necessities—even clothing, shoes, etc.,—and as rubles are almost valueless unless the purchaser has authority to buy food or clothing at the card price, wages become of secondary importance. The essential thing is to live.

Under these conditions, what is the real value of the slightly less than seventy rubles per month, average wage, officially reported by the Soviet authorities as being paid to industrial workers in the Soviet Union? It is assuredly not the eight dollars per week that the artificially pegged "official" exchange would suggest. An economist has reported that a comparison of the regular retail price level of the Soviet Union with that of the United States shows that on March 1st, 1930, retail prices were about 61 per cent. higher in Russia than in America. Foreign residents in Moscow say that retail prices generally are more than double those of "international retail markets"—and British prices are gen-

erally considered as the criteria in making figures of this nature.

In this connection it is interesting to note that when Russian butter (1929-30), as sold by the Soviet Co-operatives, was selling to the workers at 60 cents per pound, butter in the Russian "open" or "free" market—available for additional purchases over prescribed quantities—was priced at \$2.50 per pound, and the same Russian butter was being offered in the British markets at 31 cents per pound. It is also well to note that no goods can be imported into Russia except such as enter through Government channels, the State being the sole importer and exporter. The Soviet Union is one of the many foreign countries that have bitterly attacked the United States Protective Tariff. Russia, we are officially told (through the Moscow propaganda and publicity mill), has "no embargoes in effect as has been erroneously and maliciously claimed by our enemies" and goods can cross the Soviet border at any time "provided the required tariff is paid"; they deliberately fail to say, however, that the excessive duties imposed make importations prohibitive, and the tariff schedule—if one really exists—is a joke. For instance, the duty on coffee was stated (1930) at 15 rubles per kilo, or, say, \$3.48 per pound. Eve Garrette Grady says that the duty assessed, when she was in Russia, was \$10. for a pound of coffee, \$5. for a can of grapefruit, \$87.50 for a box of stationery (costing \$1.50 in the United States), and \$150. for a simple miner's lamp worth not more than one dollar. We are also told of an American who, because of the soap shortage in Russia, ordered two small cakes from Germany and was assessed \$40. duty.

In capitalistic countries, money represents real and definite value, with associated purchasing power; this is not the case in Russia. The general introduction of the rationing system has meant a still further lowering of the standard of living so far as food consumption is concerned. With small, nominal wages, restricted food disbursements by rationing, and the outrageous and almost unbelievable prices asked for food "on the outside," money is virtually useless to the Russian worker; for he generally cannot buy with his wages the quantity of food which is the difference between what he feels that he needs and should have and what the State ordains that he must reduce to and be satisfied with—at least during "the emergency"; which, by the way, has been in existence throughout the fourteen years of revolution and seems to be continuing indefinitely. Where the process of rationing is carried to the extent that it is in the Soviet Union, money rapidly loses both its value and its importance.

The Russian proletarian's average wage of, say, four or five dollars per week buying power (American basis, but without obtaining American quality) is not net compensation for services rendered. From a worker's wages are deducted membership fees, labor-union dues, compulsory assessments to be paid such societies as "The Association for the Relief of Political Prisoners in Capitalistic Lands" and "The Association for Aviation and Chemical Warfare," also instalments to pay for government bonds or "Industrialization loans." The maximum wage said to be paid any member of the Communist Party is 225 rubles per month (some \$113. per month on an artificial exchange basis and probably nearer \$50. in

real value). The members of the Communist Party, however, get and highly value their "perquisites," and the more important their position and the greater their power, the more "velvet" or "sugar" they draw or grab.

The Soviet Communists have come out strongly for piece-work; they demand speed and increased output, and this at a greatly reduced cost; the result is that piece-work rates are steadily reduced as the productivity of the worker increases. It is authoritatively stated that the definite Communist policy is to prevent wages rising beyond a certain norm—no matter how competent, industrious and dexterous a worker may be. Piece-work in Russia is merely a method of driving employees to greater productivity without giving the workers any reward for their greater or unusual and wearing efforts. This is task work, as demanded of slaves, and a large percentage of the labor in Russia can be likened to the Israelites toiling in bondage in Egypt under a despotic Pharaoh.

The Soviets use the League of Communist Youth as "Light Cavalry" and "Shock Brigades," wherever labor is employed, to "jazz up" and boost production when the quota set, or officially expected, is not being realized. The supposed and claimed virtue of the "shock troops" does not lie in their experience or in their knowledge, but rather in their youthful enthusiasm, their willingness to sacrifice much for the cause, work day and night until they collapse, attempt anything and try to force it through by sheer momentum. As far back as 1918, Lenin wrote, "In the last analysis, the productivity of labor is very important; indeed, it is critically important for the conquest of the new social order." Russia is suf-

fering to-day from a "quantity" production complex that sacrifices quality and from a system that rushes out units—speeded by executive orders and shock troops,—without proper regard being given to the quality, serviceability and durability of the product. Stalin, however, is a great advocate of shock troops, enthusers, "speeders up" and "pinch hitters." "Shock brigades," he says, "will change labor from a heavy and shameful burden to a matter of honor and glory—to a task of valor and heroism." An American mechanic does not consider his work "a heavy and shameful burden," but, rather, a useful, pleasant and gainful occupation. He would, however, undoubtedly agree that if compensation for his labor consisted of rationed food and a crude shelter, with practically nothing else, and no individual liberty whatsoever, then, to work at all, or even to exist under such conditions, would be considered heroic; like the Russian peasant, he would feel that it would probably be far pleasanter to be dead.

The Soviet Government has been guilty of a lot of tricky juggling with respect to government bonds, sold under compulsion to their forced and low-price labor. Old bond issues have been converted into new ones, which are not even put into the possession of the purchaser, but are "deposited" for him in safe keeping so that he cannot sell his bonds, even if he is foolish enough to think that he owns them. Economists have no hesitation in saying that the Soviet Government is working dangerously near to repudiation of their internal debts—a not surprising step, considering their refusal to acknowledge any of "old Russia's" foreign indebtedness. The average worker is deceived by receiving, from time to time, an interest payment on his bonds, but

even Russia would be willing to pay interest charges temporarily, if, by so doing, it becomes easier to work toward repudiation of the principal. As a matter of fact, forcing the worker to accept government bonds and pay for them by instalments, with these payments deducted from his already pitifully low wages, is an actual reduction in wages, and the worker has no voice in the matter, and no redress. He is not free; he is a slave. He is forced to work and forced to be satisfied with what wages he receives—when, as, and how.

Eliot Wadsworth says that "in 1930-31 bonds were distributed to the people by selling campaigns to an aggregate amount of more than three and one-half billion rubles. Within a year or two the National Savings Bank has been inaugurated, and a strong drive is being made to encourage the people to make deposits. Such deposits go into the National Treasury and become a liability of the government. It seems a contradiction of Communist principle to urge people who are not allowed to own property to invest their hard-earned rubles in bonds or accumulate a savings account. Such methods of replenishing the Soviet Treasury might appear somewhat capitalistic."

It is the definite policy of the Soviet Government to get its hands upon the savings, if any, of all the people. Peasants, in general, are put under "social pressure" to take their savings—if they have any—out of the proverbial family stocking and deposit in the State Savings Bank; to subscribe to State loans, thus turning these funds over to the government; to pay the agricultural tax in advance and to assume the burden of paying for additional bonds on the instalment plan to an amount that will

prevent any further cash savings. The savings of the entire population, urban and rural, are being mobilized for State purposes by means of State internal loans, industrialization bonds, or Five-Year Plan victory loans. It is said that there is "no compulsion to subscribe," but the Communist Party, the labor unions, house and factory committees, local Soviets, and the machinery of the dictator all down the line exert such relentless pressure that subscription is not only considered a duty, but a necessity for self-protection, and in practical operation it is obligatory. If the amount subscribed by an individual is considered too small he is scurrilously abused on the Wall Papers, and if his subscription is deemed liberal his name is posted on the Red Board—an acknowledgment of merit and honor. This is known as Socialistic competition. It is a scheme of the State to win back all the money paid as wages over and above the net cost of living, and that on the plane as decreed by the State.

An American engineer, returning from Russia, says that in his opinion the average wage paid the Russian workman to-day on an artificial exchange basis (where there is no exchange—merely an arbitrary decree) is nominally \$1.58 per day, which he estimates is equivalent in buying power to about 87 cents per day, American money. But, he adds, "In 1929-30 approximately one-third of each Russian worker's wages was voluntarily invested in State loans, under pressure bordering on compulsion." If a workman can barely live on what is actually allowed him "net" as wages, and what is charged him for everything he has to have in order to exist, he is compelled to figure very close and is deprived of all margin, as well as comforts. If work-

men should succeed in saving, wages would be reduced. The Soviet Union does not intend to have "surplus" money in the hands of labor, and they stand for the simple life, a bare existence with no "bourgeois frills and nonsense."

The Communists in power are doing all that they can to eliminate the need and use of money and to stop paying money wages; workers are being urged to save money and to bank their money in State savings banks. Some factories are now paying their labor by deposits made in their name in a savings bank. Some factories pay their workers only part cash and deposit the balance in a bank to prevent its being spent. This compulsory deduction from wages is one more illustration of typically Russian methods to obtain their ultimate objective of "No Wages and No Money." It is naively said that it is hoped that before long the Russian worker will become accustomed to dispensing, in a large measure, with the use of currency, even for the payment of wages; the intermediate stage is bank-credit and, possibly, a checking account (Imagine this, in a land 50 per cent. illiterate!), but the Government owns the banks and supervises all withdrawals, and the workers will find—like the peasant, with his land, horse and cow, becoming collectivized by force—that it is easy to put in, but a very different matter to draw out.

Calvin B. Hoover says, "The movement now on foot to pay workers through savings banks is seriously discussed as a means to still further reduce the use of money. . . . The development of communal living, by which every one is eventually to live in large houses, with common kitchens and dining-halls, will also operate to lessen the need of money. It will be possible for the worker to give one order

to the savings bank, which will cover all his expenditures for food, shelter, light and heat. Or it is possible that in factory communities these may be included in the wage, so that no additional mechanism of payment will be necessary."

The first great step toward the abolition of all wages is to include the cost of "room and board" in the wage, allowing the worker some money for clothing and incidentals; the next step is to clothe, as well as provide food and shelter, and give the worker a nominal or insignificant amount of money for incidentals—which is what is theoretically done in some Communes and agricultural "Collectives." This small weekly, or monthly, cash contribution is gradually handled, however, as if it were not part of the compensation for services actually due, but rather a sort of dole or charity donation; the stage is then set so that all wages and the passing of money between the employer and the employee as remuneration for work performed or services rendered can be discontinued, and slavery in spirit and essential fact becomes complete slavery in all of its details of operation, phases and ramifications.

Soviet Russia is dishonest, artful, resourceful and unscrupulous with respect to its currency and to all money matters. If it were not so, it couldn't continue to exist, not to mention engage in trade. The Soviet Union is a law unto itself; it defies all universal economic law in the realm of money, as well as of goods and labor, and Russia—one-sixth of the world in land area—considers itself big, or at least important, enough to be a world in itself and sufficient unto itself, defying all the laws of both God and man. There are many strange and amusing angles to the situation, however, as far as interna-

tional relations and interplay are concerned. To obtain foreign money that has real value outside the State, objects of art bought by foreigners from the government shops in Russia must be paid for in foreign valuta; rubles will positively not be accepted. Here we find a government refusing to accept its own currency in its own officially operated and owned shops.

It should be borne in mind that Soviet money—aside from its “three-in-one” unique characteristic—does not possess “the full attributes” of currency of so-called capitalistic countries. The possession of money does not always give one purchasing power, even over the wide range of (1) foreign, (2) communist and (3) bourgeois scale of values. Some commodities are not obtainable without a ration book; others require a book which evidences membership in a consumer’s Co-operative Society, and there are some commodities that can be obtained only by the presentation of ration book, membership card, identification and, possibly, the “high sign”; quantities, moreover, are restricted and sometimes very sharply limited without warning, so at times the full amount desired, notwithstanding its reasonableness and moderation, is not forthcoming, even to the Class A and the “élite.” Moreover, when the goods in any store are exhausted, all the food books and co-operative cards in the world will not furnish the rationed amount to any person—even if that person has stood patiently in line for hours. This, moreover, is quite a common occurrence. It has been said, “To get food in Soviet Russia one stands in line for hours, and sometimes—during a shortage—repeats for days, before one is lucky enough to get it; to obtain a railway ticket one

stands in line before the official window-opening time day after day, and when one gets a ticket the train for that day has probably gone."

There is no doubt that the Soviet Government is engaged in a campaign to take all possible "surplus" funds out of the hands of the people. The amount of currency outstanding is said to be "far too large because of the restricted supply of consumable commodities." It is also said that the Soviet Government realizes that if much of the "redundant money" could be reduced, the time wastefulness and annoyance of queues—now a peculiar Russian institution—would be materially lessened. The State issues bonds in many devious and subtle ways, and makes subscriptions on the part of the workers obligatory. New bond issues are being constantly imposed upon an unwilling, but helpless population, with the sale and hypothecation of the bonds forbidden. Prices of commodities are jockeyed and the State seeks to "lessen the assaults on the inadequate supply." In plain language, the people are said to have too much money, and, in the minds of leading Communists, any money paid to workers seems to be "too much." Under these conditions, what was the reason that employees of the State, in such centers as Moscow, Leningrad, Kharkov, Kiev, Rostov, etc., from early August, 1930, to January, 1931, are said to have received no more than one-half of their wages? It is reported that the reason advanced was "stringencies of the money situation."

The Russian people in general, and particularly the peasant class and unskilled industrial laborers, resent the substitution of paper for metal money. They see no gold and know that its circulation in coins is prohibited by the Communist Government.

The Russians have been through some raw financing; have seen the effect of printing-presses turning out Soviet "money-tokens" in quantity, and have experienced the effect of the operations of the State Bank in exploiting the chervonetz, and in later attempting to tie it up to a theoretical gold ruble as the unit of account. Many of the Russian people are not aware that, whereas the decree of the Council of People's Commissars, when the chervonetz was first issued, provided that "the date when the exchange of bank-notes into gold (at the parity established in the edict providing for their issuance) will begin will be announced in a separate government decree," no such date has ever been announced and, notwithstanding the explicit promise given, no such action is apparently contemplated in the present or dim, distant future. The Russian peasants do not like paper money; they are skeptical of it, as they are of all other Communist notes, bonds, obligations and promises. Whereas the chervonetz is said to be worth an old ten-ruble gold piece, they know better; for they cannot buy clothes and farming tools with a handful of these State bank-notes as they used to in the old days with one or two gold pieces.

The Russians' dislike for paper money, which is so chameleonic and uncertain in both present and future buying powers, resulted in a lot of the people—who, of course, could never put their hands on any gold coins—accumulating gradually some silver coins and hiding them for the inevitable "emergency" that is in the background of every "old" Russian's head who can clearly remember some twenty years or more back. The Soviet Government, becoming conscious of a perceptible amount

of silver currency being removed from circulation, investigated conditions; they searched the homes of the people and, in August, 1930, it is known by some Americans (visiting Russia at the time) that a number of men were shot for "hoarding silver coins"; apparently the penalty imposed varied with the amount found in the possession of any person or family, and to be discovered with \$25. or more in silver, according to one sociologist, meant death. Eve Garrette Grady says that during August and September, 1930, "thousands of private homes in all the principal cities were being stealthily searched by the dreaded Soviet secret police, the G.P.U., and thousands and thousands of Russian citizens were bundled off to jail and many of them lined up and shot for the crime of hoarding, let us say, fifty dollars in silver."

Soviet "economists" predict the general use of some type of bank cheques during a transitional period, when currency in circulation is being materially reduced by Communist orders, and before the "ideal" of absolute socialistic Communist life is attainable. Berkovski boldly admits that to-day Soviet currency is not money at all in a true sense; it is simply "labor tickets," which entitle the possessor to a certain amount of commodities needed to sustain life—if such needed commodities are on hand in the stores and are obtainable in harmony with the dictator's decree,—when and as desired by the holder of the labor ticket and other tickets that are required for identification and endorsement. "Red Rations by Red Tape" is a very involved, wasteful, inefficient and stupid business, and only a very ignorant, browbeaten and terrorized people would tolerate it.

An investigating resident economist has said that it is the hope of the Communist theorists in the Soviet Union that the use of money can be largely eliminated by the further progressive development of the system of rationing, "which is the only alternative to a money economy." The building of kitchens, dining-halls, or mess-houses in quantity, it is said, is part of the general, broad plan to enforce community life "in all its simplicity" and ultimately succeed in virtually eliminating the use of money.

Soviet Russia seeks to operate as if the State put into effect a one hundred per cent. income tax, and then, in order to keep the people working and producing, decided that as it would be unwise "to kill the goose that laid the golden egg" they had better give it shelter and food, but promptly confiscate to themselves every egg as it is laid. Labor in the Soviet Union is not only forced, but it is slave labor of the captive type and prison labor of the chain-gang variety—with no hope of freedom or of any release from physical, mental and spiritual bondage.

In the *artel* type of "Kolkhoz" collective farms, which are, in theory, co-operative institutions, profits were promised to be divided among the peasant "owners" and operators. The Russian peasant is shrewd and skeptical of communist statements, as well as poor, so he bargained for a daily allowance as an advance on the profits that the Communists said would come to him—these advance payments being used for prime and necessary, immediate living expenses. It was a good thing that the Muzhik had to have and obtained—by pressure—a small sum advanced to him day by day, for that is generally all he ever gets. At the end of the season it is

common to hear that the Kolkhoz operated with no profit. Even if some small paper profits are shown—which is rare—the peasant knows, from experience, that his “masters” will advance lots of reasons why the money is not available and cannot be distributed, the most common being that it is needed for further capital investment. Balance sheets and deficits mean nothing to the Russian peasant; he wants food to eat, a hut to live in, and money with which to buy necessary clothing and supplies. The peasant is much more interested in a pair of weather-proof boots for himself than in a new barn or a tractor for the collective farm. His daily allowance he now figures as his wage; the management of the Kolkhoz, who is a Communist, can make promises and paint flowery pictures of the future, but the peasant knows that all that he will ever get for his serf-labor is what he can draw daily to keep alive. In the commune type of Kolkhoz the co-operatives are housed, clothed and fed, so no “allowances” or wages are paid at all.

The Soviet State “ideal” of no money would operate to make all labor in Russia technically analogous to plantation-slave labor, where the workers are paid no wages at all, but are fed, sheltered and clothed in order that they may keep physically fit and capable of work. The Communist dictator considers, as the “ideal” existence of the working man, the sort of life and treatment that an American gives to his horse, but this only in a cold-blooded, economic sense. The average American is fond of his horse and treats it kindly, even though the horse is a slave of man and is subjugated and dominated by bit, whip, or spur so that, with all its strength, it obeys its owner and master. No “kindness” and no

humanity resides in, or emanates from, the Kremlin; the Communist dictator and his staff are cold-blooded and "hard-boiled"—exactng, domineering and merciless.

The real man of individuality, who reveres and demands liberty, claims the right to sell his labor, his skill and the product of his brains in a fair and open market for a return that will give him the greatest satisfaction in money, and in other things; with the money compensation that he receives for his work, he demands that he be free to spend it as he pleases, to buy what he wants, when he wants it; and he considers freedom in spending or in saving, in giving or in lending, as fundamentally important as freedom to work, to choose a job, and to bargain for wages.

In Russia, the worker is now supposed to obtain the full fruits of his labor. "Surplus value" no longer exists, according to Communist doctrine, since the proletariat state has succeeded the capitalistic state. What are these "full fruits" of labor? What is real, practical, tangible and usable "surplus value"? Where is the "surplus" that was to be wrested from capitalists and spread among labor, which was to so greatly benefit the worker? In Russia it would appear that surplus has not only been expropriated by the State and the State rulers made capitalists of a new order, but a "surplus" has disappeared or been transferred to a deficit in actual working. The Russian, enjoying the much-discussed and featured "surplus value" of the revolutionary intelligentsia, is not living on any higher plane than he formerly did—economically or spiritually; he is working to-day for what is virtually his keep—reduced to the lowest possible amount and quality

(and expense) consistent with the maintenance of life. The worker in a democratic-capitalistic country obtains all that the Russian Communist worker receives, and, in addition, (1) a substantial part of the "surplus value," if any is created, coupled with both liberty to make and obtain more, and the freedom to own it, enjoy it and use it, as he pleases, when he gets it, (2) a preferential consideration of compensation without regard to the "earnings" of others or of the whole. His pay is sure; his food and supplies are abundant and are not rationed; his wages are not assessed or padlocked, and the economic evils of deficits and losses do not materially assail his pay envelope until margins, reserves, surplus and credit are pretty well depleted by capitalists, of which group he himself may belong by the exercise of thrift associated with industry. Russian Communism, full of promises for the worker, is not, after fourteen years of opportunity, demonstrating that it can or ever will realize any of them. With his theoretical and much-vaunted "surplus value," the Russian worker is the poorest paid and is being forced to live on the lowest plane of any "white man" labor on the face of the earth to-day; and, moreover, he is the world's most fettered and immured serf—void of all liberty; he is a "wage-slave" without a real wage. Moreover, if every promise or hope of the Russian Communist is realized in the economic life of the proletarian worker, he will still be infinitely lower in the scale of living, and in the enjoyment of the comforts of life, than the average American worker. That is why the propaganda that permeates Russia condemns the capitalistic mode of life and tabus comforts as undesirable, immoral and unnecessary. Private property that is repudiated by the

Communists is a workman's home site, with house and garden, a personally-owned piano, victrola, or radio, an automobile, bicycle, or boat, a few chickens, or a pig, etc., etc., just as much as it is a factory, farm, forest, railroad, mine, or bank. Many a man has been condemned as a Kulak—a rich peasant—in Russia, and driven forth, outlawed and "deprived," to die, who actually owned (for his entire family), in real money value, less than ten per cent. of the average wealth of all Americans (men, women and children), and whose yearly income was, theoretically, less than one-quarter and, actually, less than one-eighth of the average American wage.

Whereas the Constitution of the Soviet Union is supposedly opposed to all exploitation of man by man, it says nothing about the exploitation of man by the State—by the Central Committee, the Politbureau, and Stalin, the Dictator. Lenin referred to the Soviet State as "a special oak cudgel, nothing more." It was to be "a tool of the proletariat in its class struggle"; actually, it offers no safeguards against the exploitation of individual man, of a class, or of a people. The cudgel in the hands of a fanatical dictator has beaten man, the individual; man, the worker, and man, the thinker, into insensibility. Not only is the individual in the Soviet Union being sacrificed for Communism and the so-called State, but the present generation of mature people and the passing generation of the old are being deliberately sacrificed, supposedly in the interest of the young and coming generations. The Soviet cudgel enforces discipline in every phase of life; it browbeats and rivets shackles upon every individual, every group and every class—even to the manual worker, who, as a Communist, boasts of

the dictatorship of the proletariat. Bruce C. Hopper, in "Pan-Sovietism" (1931), says: "Not even the Ptolemies, who managed Egypt as a private estate to bring them income . . . devised such a system of all-inclusive control of the minutiae of economic life. . . . Command of all the resources of the country, even to the small change in the pocket of the individual, a condition which seems to be approaching, will mean that the Soviet State, at any given moment, can hurl enormous economic power into an international conflict, be it commercial or military. This economic control demonstrates the power brought to focus by a state run as a business concern, with unlimited political, social and economic prerogatives. The Soviet economic statecraft may be justified by the end in view or condemned for its human cost"—which is human injustice, the loss of all individual liberty, and the sacrifice of the immediate welfare of the one and the all.

"What makes application of embargoes against Soviet 'convict' goods somewhat futile unless indiscriminate," says Mr. Hopper, "is that all of the one hundred and sixty million people of the Soviet Union, party and non-party alike, are under a régime of forced labor, working in places not always of their own choosing and at a tempo that only the enthusiasts and shock brigades find agreeable. This gives the Soviet Union a military complexion, a state preparing for economic war." Labor in Russia is militarized. It is fed (to a degree), clothed (indifferently), housed (at times outrageously), and paid (theoretically) nominal wages, but it is positively not free. Money—and therefore wages—means nothing except as is decreed by the authority of the employer of all labor

—which is the State. The Russian proletariat, the Russian peasant, the Russian citizen of the Soviet Union, in the words of Marx and the Communist manifesto, "have nothing to lose but their chains." Absolutely nothing! No home; no private property; no money; no liberty; no individual self-respect; no happiness; no inner satisfaction; no spiritual faith or hope. And having nothing, and the world—outside of the control of the Communist dictators—having much, it is also true that, in the words of Marx, "they have a world to gain." These words of the famous Communist manifesto are correct in a literal sense, with the meaning and substance diametrically opposed to, and the absolute antithesis of, the meaning as intended by Marx.

A Communist official in Moscow, talking with Albert Muldavin, refused to consider the American Revolution as a real revolution, which he said had to be one "where the workers cast away their chains." The American, with typical humor, retorted, "Americans will never cast away their chains. They need their chains on rainy days to prevent their automobiles from skidding."

An American engineer who has worked in Russia for the Soviet Government, in reviewing Eve Garrette Grady's book "Seeing Red," comments favorably on the well-written work and says that it recalls to mind many interesting experiences of his own. However, he implies that the book is "too feminine." This is an interesting criticism, or, possibly, it is rather a sort of half-hearted or camouflaged defense of himself and of other most worthy, but thoughtless, engineers who have hired out professionally to assist their country's enemy. If hard-headed specialists, thinking primarily of blue-prints,

mechanical and industrial problems and their solutions, so deify engineering and their great god "Economic Mass Production" that they lose sight of social and political ideals and personal obligations, and if these mathematical-minded specialists are so engrossed with drawing-boards, formulae, machinery, processes, output and material things that they have no real contacts and interplay with, or sense the human problems and feelings of, the populace, then it is splendid that a woman who has sensed conditions as they exist in the mind, heart and soul of human beings, and who is not only observing and analytical, but also capable of expressing herself with both force and vigor, should have had the opportunity of obtaining knowledge of conditions as they actually exist on the ground, and the courage, moreover, to honestly write the truth about what she saw and what she knows. What we need in America to-day is less theorizing, less excusing, less leaning backward, less gullibility, less intelligentsia fence-straddling, and more real honest-to-goodness "straight from the shoulder" statements of facts, carefully gleaned, impartially weighed and verified, and fearlessly presented. To attempt to justify the Russian "enforced labor" system, with its enslaving and absolute domination of the workers—its "force and terrorism," its rationing system, queues, starvation methods, etc., etc., by ironically saying that in America also the man who "won't work, won't eat," is not only dissembling and side-stepping, or dodging, a fundamental issue, but is attempting an evasion that is dishonorable to a most worthy profession.

Eve Garrette Grady, recently banished from Russia, has proved that Stalin has the usual Achil-

les heel of a despotic dictator. Stalin is brave and domineering, fearless and unscrupulous; his life has proved that he can stand abuse and pain, whippings, and both mental and physical torture; he can meet and fight any adversary, and he will not run away or lower his flag; yet this "man of the people," cast in a heroic, proletarian mold, who can meet, with calmness and confidence, any resistance and any opposition, cannot stand a woman laughing at him. Stalin can be attacked, and he will defend himself; he can bathe in blood, and the wails of tortured humanity may be as music to his ears, but he cannot tolerate a ripple of innocent, but pointed, laughter directed at his most serious and self-conscious person. Russia would not be communistic and Stalin would not be the most despotic dictator of history if Russia could lift itself above the enveloping and depressing pall of tragedy, see the blue sky overhead, shake itself to a conscious wakefulness, and laugh at Stalin and at itself.

Maurice Hindus, in "Humanity Uprooted," recording his experiences in Russia, says that a girl with a hat is pushed out of a queue, waiting in line for food, and labeled "bourgeois"—a word that "still carries its lacerating barb,"—because other girls are not wearing hats and "class consciousness" cannot tolerate "differences." One is compelled to be a conformist, and that on an exceedingly low plane, in order to live unmolested. A young Russian journalist, riding a saddle-horse in the suburbs of a city, was reported to the G.P.U. as a suspected anti-revolutionist. A well-dressed person in Russia is either a foreigner (and, if so, will generally be treated with respect by the serfs of Communism and, at times, looked up to as one of a superior order—to

be admired and aspired to,—but far beyond the Russian peasant's or laborer's reach) or a despicable Russian bourgeois, subject to and inviting persecution, imprecations and anathemas. It is said that not a single peasant (farmer) in the whole of Soviet Russia possesses either a telephone or an automobile. We are told by investigators that there are "not more than one hundred privately-owned automobiles in the whole of Russia, and most of these are taxis, fit more for the junk-heap than for service," but even if a motor-car is "still a mark of bourgeois mendacity," the Communist officials and Party heads ride around in their cars, driven by their personal chauffeurs; some of these cars are of the best foreign makes, but, of course, they are said to be owned by the Soviet State, even though exclusively used by an individual.

To have a cake of toilet soap causes a Russian to feel like an aristocrat of the old régime; to have a few cakes stored away may lead to arrest and possible conviction as a Nepman—and, therefore, a "counter-revolutionist,"—provided the ardent "light cavalry" snoopers of the Komsomols ferret them out during one of their "inspired" periodic trunk-searching house raids. During a recent month no soap was sold on ration books, and more recently the allowance was half a cake per month per person. In the outside market the price asked was four dollars a cake for very poor soap, denounced by a competent medical authority as "injurious to the skin." The shortage of soap—both toilet and laundry—is universal in Russia, and the land, as a result, is filthy; the lack of animal fat is advanced as the reason for the condition; yet Russia is a heavy exporter of soap, its best and purest product being dumped in

foreign markets and sold to the foreign consuming trade far below the cost of domestic product. There is no wrapping-paper in Russia—such is bourgeois nonsense. If you go to the market you can carry your purchases or your rations home unwrapped; the French do it with bread; why not the Russians with a fish or a cut of horse meat? There is a button shortage, but clothes can be fastened so long as pins and other substitutes hold out.

New houses and apartment buildings, dining-halls, kitchens and dormitories are being built for workers in Russia, but the space available for living purposes, where and when it is needed, is woefully small; the structures and facilities, moreover, that do exist are generally in bad repair, with few, if any, "conveniences." Living conditions in Russia are primitive and very poor, and, moreover, they are badly run down and kept dirty. Whole families are compelled to live in one room, and so long as there is space to get in a room and go to sleep on the floor, that room is deemed to have "available space" for others, in case there is a social workers' or employees' demand for shelter. Charles Powell, referring to the crowded and unhealthful living conditions in Russia, says that below him in a house at Soliskamsk "in a fourteen- by twelve-foot single room there lived an old woman, her son, the son's wife, their baby, two girls (one of whom worked in a restaurant), and a man roomer. They ate in this room and all slept on the floor in their clothes. Eve Garrette Grady says, "In Moscow, six, seven, even as many as ten persons occupy one small room. It is the situation everywhere. In fact, a recent law has been passed stating that no Soviet citizen is entitled to more than 8 ft. by 5 ft. (or 40 sq. ft.) for

living space. All of which spells finis to family life and the end to the place of child in the home."

To be a proletarian in Russia means to belong to a privileged class, for the rude manual laborer (engaged in industry, but not in agriculture) is the "nobleman" of the Soviet Union, and the very word "proletarian" is not only the highest badge of honor, but an "open sesame" to either peculiar rights or beneficent exemptions in both custom and law. If a request is filed for admission to a trade union, a military academy, or a university, it will be acted upon immediately and favorably by the authorities if the applicant is a proletarian and of proletarian parents. Ancestry is important, even in Russia's Revised Social Register, the old bottom becoming the top of the list, and the old top, the bottom.

In a court of law, the Judge does not always give priority to evidence and proven fact, but seeks to know if the defendant is a proletarian; if he is, his sentence will be materially lightened, or he may be acquitted of the crime or offense as charged. Whereas the law in our Western civilization is for the protection of the individual and his property, in Soviet Russia it is designed for the protection of the State. In Russia, the State is everything; the man, nothing. C. B. Hoover says, "The law is not the master of the court—indeed, one is tempted to say that the law is of minor importance in the matter. The court will consider the circumstances, punishment will be meted out, and the law can go to the devil," and, again, "Human life is not hedged about with the legal protection which it has in capitalistic countries." Krylenko, in his "Court Structure of the R.S.F.S.R." writes, "For us, for the Workers' and Peasants' State, no form of court is acceptable ex-

cept one which always, and under all conditions, will guarantee the defense of the interest of the workers. All state authority is nothing but a weapon of social force and constraint, with the aid of which a given governing class in a given society realizes its political sovereignty and guards its economic sovereignty." Bukharin, in "A B C of Communism," also says that the proletariat will never permit any other class to judge proletarians. "The judges are elected by the workers alone . . . and solely from among the workers. For the exploiters, the only right that remains is the right of being judged"—by the one-time so-called "exploited." Everything in Russia—food, shelter, and even "justice"—is graduated and on a sliding scale, in favor of the proletarian and the Communist.

Teachers, doctors, artists, actors, etc., have to join labor unions if they are to be recognized by the proletarian Communists and get a chance to live. Membership in a union enables one to obtain theatre tickets at half rate, but it also carries with it food tickets that give the holder more and better food than those not so favored and privileged—therefore, every one who works, or wants to work at anything, must be a labor unionist—and all unions are under communist control.

It is significant that whereas democratic America is trying to solve the alcohol beverage problem by prohibition and force, the despotic dictator of Russia, who controls the people more than any people have ever been controlled in the history of the world, says that "prohibition by arbitrary fiat is impossible," but he is working rapidly "for temperance" (and not prohibition—an impossible, impractical

condition) "by education and well-organized propaganda."

Russia, to-day, encourages the proper kind of tourist visits and inspection, provided the tourists are known to be harmless, superficial and stupid, and, what is more important, provided they have real foreign money. They must not take Russian rubles into Russia, but only foreign currency, on which, by exchange, they can be unmercifully cheated in the interest of the Soviet Union. As Joseph L. Thomson says, "the tenderly-conducted tourist is allowed to see only the bright and pleasant things in the gloomy land." Tourists are moved like clock-work under the capable guidance of specially-trained guides and interpreters; they see special sights, travel on special trains and make special stops, eat special food and live in specially fixed-up, cleaned and equipped hotels for the tourist season; they witness special theatrical performances and see many more things that are staged for their benefit, but which are not acknowledged on the program as either "shows" or "window-dressing." These tourists, spoon-fed and fitted with Soviet blinders and martingale, see a "staged" Russia in a series of well-thought-out acts, but they do not see the props or get any peep behind the scenes. In this respect, Russia, the world's capital of guileful propaganda, for crude faking makes Hollywood an "also ran." They are escorted to places where they can loiter and dwell—if they so desire; other places they are hurried and almost spirited past or through, and every minute they themselves are under surveillance. They may be in Russia during a horrible food shortage, but they never know it. They may be in cities where men are being shot almost daily for hiding a little

silver money, or spirited away by the G.P.U. for "counter-revolutionary" thoughts, but they know nothing of such things. They have soap, toilet paper, towels, and all such kindred "necessities" at the hotel, but couldn't be made to believe that all such things are "stage properties" that Russians never enjoy, and are collected carefully after they go. Mrs. Grady reports conversation with a Soviet guide who was piloting some Americans where it was supposedly right and proper for them to go in Moscow. A portly matron, observing a large queue in front of a government store waiting patiently in line to receive their rations, inquired what the people were doing and was promptly informed that "as yesterday was pay-day, the people were waiting in line to deposit their money in the bank," an answer that satisfied and apparently pleased—everybody. Many Americans who are working in Russia as specialists, receiving special consideration and advantages, and living in a somewhat artificial atmosphere, nevertheless know, more or less, what it is to feel the pinch of food shortages; and probably many of their wives, who may come more in contact with the inner working of the Soviet system pertaining to household food and supplies, and who can intuitively sense both undercurrents and the all-permeating spirit of things, must become not only disgusted, but nauseated, at the deceit and hypocrisy in evidence on the part of Soviet officials, on the one hand, and the gullibility of foreign visitors, who seem to have an inordinate appetency for being bamboozled, on the other.

The "Shaw and Astor" recent Russian tour is a good (even though somewhat extreme) illustration of how the Soviets handle tourists. The vivacious

Lady M.P. and the Socialist Sage of Whitehall Gardens, with a seemingly rather unimportant supporting cast, including Nancy's "mere husband," were ciceroned by Maxim Litvinov, the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, and were guided and moved around on Russia's especially cleaned and varnished chess-board by the Soviet master player—their every move, with every sight they saw, being exactly as preordained. The British "celebrities'" visit to Russia was very short, the entire tour being limited to some nine days, which was brief enough, coupled with high-pressure attention and entertainment, to prevent or avoid their sensing actual conditions. Both visitors being notorious publicity-hounds, the Russians "did themselves proud" and fully embraced—from Stalin down—this splendid occasion of getting some good advertising across as "news" and of putting something over non-communist peoples. A boisterous theatrical welcome, or opera-bouffe reception, was staged at Moscow, led by Anatol Lunarcharsky; later, Jester Shaw's seventy-fifth birthday was celebrated by burning communist incense before the "Great Man's" altar—which he loved; hand-picked escorts showed them the usual featured tourists' sights; they "did" the tourist properties and "set ups" in the usual way, and were kept so busy and occupied that they had no time or opportunity to think or even observe. Stalin himself, the mysterious and inaccessible, granted them a much-advertised personal interview, which greatly impressed the female member of the vaudeville team and gave her something to talk about and never forget: "He talked with us over two hours; he never talked to any one so long before." What an honor! What propaganda!

After splendid de luxe treatment—accommodations, food and transportation—with the Soviet Government as nurse, guardian and stage manager, and a brief sojourn in which they neither saw nor sensed the real Russia in travail and chains, Shaw reports, "I found traveling in Soviet Russia both pleasant and safe," and Nancy Astor says, "Russia is the best-run country on earth." It is interesting to observe, however, that Madam Krynine continues to be held as hostage and a prisoner in Russia; apparently Britain's leading Lady M.P. has quickly forgotten the plight of one of her own sex that a member of the intelligentsia petitioned her (with Shaw) to help. But why bother about one poor soul when vast millions are in the same devilish predicament? The Soviets are to be congratulated on having staged a splendid show that "went over well," with the small, but (from a publicity standpoint) important party of theatrical press-feeding British. Shaw, however, is not always a buffoon, and occasionally (notwithstanding his characteristic "red" necktie) his brain works free and true. It is significant that, amidst all his rantings, he should say, "Russia is putting her house in order and all other nations are playing the fool." Russia, by her Five-Year Plan, is "putting her house in order," and all the other nations that are doing business with her, supplying her with machinery, expert knowledge, needed commodities, money, or credit, are most assuredly "playing the fool."

Karl K. Kitchen, writing of a recent visit to Soviet Russia, says that "American visitors this year are handled with kid gloves by the Communist officials—high and low. They are trying to make the most favorable impression on every one from capi-

talistic America—for they want every American dollar they can get to aid their Five-Year Plan”; and it is significant that his first impression of the Soviet Union was dirt, backwardness, and the brutalization of women at hard labor—the practical effect of their emancipation: “The first sight that arrested my attention on crossing the little stream which separates Finland from Soviet Russia was a barefooted woman at work on a railroad siding. She was tightening the bolts in the fishplates while several soldiers idled near by. When I emerged from the customs house I saw a dozen women at work on the near-by tracks. Barelegged, if not barefooted, they were doing the rough jobs of section-hands. Such was my first glimpse of Soviet Russia.”

Any and all Russians in the Soviet Union are considered the property of the State, just as is a machine or a beast of burden. They belong to the State and the State demands much of them, just as if they were slaves in the South in the first half of the nineteenth century. A foreigner with a passport in Russia is treated with some consideration at this time, because Russia is dependent on foreign countries to make her self-sustaining, and she therefore must walk circumspectly, to a substantial degree, until she can afford to defiantly hoist her flag and show the world what she really is. A foreigner without a passport in Russia, without influential friends and definite means of identification, is like a foreign prisoner of war in a detention camp. It is reported that some foreigners in Russia have been artfully influenced to “accept” Soviet citizenship papers (against their will) to make their enslaving less scandalous in case of publicity; such men can never leave Russia if they are deemed useful and impor-

tant by the Soviet Union; their imprisonment is for life. A young American, who is said to have been hired by the Amtorg Trading Co. to work for 400 rubles per month and sent to Russia, having succeeded in getting away from serfdom, because of his United States passport, says: "I was sent to the Ural mountains, in the vicinity of Omsk. I was put to work in a copper mine, working alongside huge Tartars, Mongolians, and a few Russians who could bear the conditions. We worked from 7 a.m. to 2 p.m. continuously, with no stop for a meal. All the time I was at the mine I had nothing to eat but black bread and tea. We received no pay, the company, or State, saying that they were holding for us any amount that may be due us. Some of the men there had been working seven months without receiving a single cent of wages over board charges. If we had had money, however, we could not have purchased food or clothing with it. A government order is necessary, even to buy bread. We were assigned quarters and crowded into small rooms. The government owns everything, and no one may protest against invasion of 'his home.' There is a law that no children under 18 years of age may work in the mines, but I have worked alongside 12- and 13-year-old Russian boys and girls in the deepest caverns in the mines."

Americans have always instinctively been opposed to employment by corporations where living opportunities and conditions make it necessary for the labor to eat in company cook-houses, sleep in company bunk-houses or in company-owned houses for married workers with their families, buy at company-owned stores and use company-owned water, gas, or electric light. The average independent and

liberty-loving American feels oppressed and dominated by this order of things, even though the corporation treats its employees eminently fair—which the majority do, though some do not.

The miners in West Virginia are now objecting to the economic relationship of the worker to the operating company, and claim that their living expense, as charged and presented to them at intervals in a "Statement of Account with Company," is taking practically all of their wages. It is true that they buy all their food, supplies, clothing, tobacco, and everything needed to run their homes; rent their houses and obtain water, light, heat and power, medical attention and hospital facilities, etc., from the company; but they have no choice, the charges made—whether fair or not—are deemed "arbitrary"; the workers feel helpless; they want to contract their own obligations in their own way, buy where they please, and pay their own bills. Charges deducted from wages do not "sit well" with them; they want to earn, own, handle, feel and spend money as individuals free of all restraint. A man who works for two weeks, buys liberally and, possibly, extravagantly from the company's stores and rents all living quarters, facilities, etc., from them, is incensed when, at the end of the period, he is presented with an account which reads in substance—wages \$48., followed by store charges for food, supplies, tobacco, clothing, rent, light, gas, water, papers, etc., aggregating, say, \$39.50, with a net pay-slip enclosed of \$8.50. Many a workman in this position fusses and fumes at this operation of the capitalist system; sometimes, if the charges made by the company are not competitive and are not at (or below) the average market price, they are justified

in kicking; but, whether fair or unfair, the practice is positively objectionable to free American labor, who even go so far as to proclaim that (using the before-stated illustrative figures) a worker's pay for two weeks was not \$48., but only \$8.50—the cost of food, supplies, clothing, rent, light, gas, water, medicine, tobacco, papers, etc., are not only minimized, but ignored.

Yet this system—that free American labor brand as highly objectionable and even “enslaving”—greatly intensified (manyfold) in viciousness, is the great ideal of Communist Russia—where, however, the plane of living is infinitely lower; choice of purchasing at the government stores is highly restricted and rationing often substituted; where all the comforts are tabued and the most innocent of inexpensive luxuries unknown, and where all labor is subjected to military discipline, cannot change or quit a job, and the individual as such is not known. The Russian system, when perfected, will tell the worker not only how and where he must work, but what he shall eat, how he shall live and clothe himself, what he shall read, what his amusements, if any, can be, etc., and there will be no “pay-slip,” covering his earned share of the “surplus” that his labor has helped to create, handed to him at any time. The West Virginia coal-miners, notwithstanding their plight (if conditions as reported are correct) and who proclaim, “We would rather starve fighting than starve working to get that yellow slip of paper,” are many times better off than Russians engaged in the same class of work; there is no comparison.

Russians are forced to tighten the belt, work, and literally (not figuratively speaking) starve, and

miners, worked beyond the limit of human endurance, with emaciated, bony frames, have had to drop their picks and shovels (by the tens of thousands), desert their posts, forage, steal, and hunt like wild animals, under the urge of self-preservation, for food to maintain life. While these deplorable conditions existed, the Communist Party was actually shipping foodstuffs and all sorts of needed supplies out of Russia and selling them at any "dumped" price, in order to obtain foreign money to pay for the purchase of foreign machines to carry forward the Soviet Five-Year Plan.

Details are at hand of the wages received and the expenses charged against an experienced and competent Russian miner and a leader of a specially-selected shock brigade (that earned "shock bonuses" for output) at Emelyanovka, in the Lenin mines, Kuznetsk Basin, during the month of July, 1931. Whereas the average miner's monthly earnings in Soviet Russia are officially stated at 83 rubles, this shock miner, Grifullin, earned 150 rubles—an unusually high figure, apparently increased by overtime, as well as by bonuses. He had four dependents, and charges made against him for the month of 31 days are: Food, 77 rubles; manufactured goods, clothing, domestic wares, 62 rubles; political contributions, 33 rubles (which includes monthly instalment deductions for State loan, membership fees to Trade Unions, Co-operative Society and Communist Party); newspapers and books, 6½ rubles; cinema (two visits), 5 rubles; water (270 gallons) and coal, 51½ rubles, making a total of 189 rubles, expenses for the month—compared with the unusually high wages (with shock bonuses, overtime, etc.) of 150 rubles; a deficit for the month of 39

rubles. No charge was made during the period for rent. In rough figures, this expert miner and leader of a shock brigade, organized to boost output, received about \$75. for a month's work (including bonuses, overtime, etc.)—which can be compared with an average Russian wage of \$41.50 for all skilled miners,—but his living expenses were \$95., with no rent charged, and, of this, the State took some \$16.50 for political contributions, assessments, etc. An analysis of the food the man received for five people is of interest: Meat, $19\frac{3}{4}$ lbs., or 2 ozs. per person per day; bread and flour, $10\frac{3}{4}$ ozs.; butter, $\frac{1}{2}$ oz.; margarine, $\frac{3}{4}$ oz.; sugar, $11\frac{1}{4}$ ozs. Other food items bought (in very small quantities, aggregating one-sixth of the total food bill) were: Potatoes, vegetables, cheese and a few eggs. It is evident from these figures that the Russian worker is indeed "in chains." After working hard, and for long hours, during a month, and earning some 80 per cent. more than the average miner, he finds that he owes the State 26 per cent. more than his wages for the month, and his only recreation during the period consisted of two moving picture "state propaganda" shows. All the charges made against him were made by the State; all his pay goes back to the State, including the "movies," and he is heavily in debt to the State as the result of a month's very hard work.

It is quite possible that Grifullin, being married, would be assisted in meeting his deficit by his wife going to work at the mines. Women have been "emancipated" in Russia and have all the "rights," but also all the "obligations," of men. If there were a shortage of labor at the mines, the women would be conscripted for physical work, so it is probable

that Grifullin's wife saved the economic status of the family by her labor and wage contribution toward household expenses. What would the family do (1) if the miner's wages were the average 83 rubles—or less; (2) if the miner had no wife to go to work in the mines? It is difficult to see where quantities of food consumed could be reduced and still sustain life, although the variety stated in this case for a worker in Russia borders on luxury. As an index of the plane of living and Russian cleanliness, Grifullin said that the amount of water he used was small, not to mention a restriction to a small piece of crude soap, because "they did not wash much"—either clothes or their bodies.

✓ Joseph L. Thomson, an Arizona consulting mining engineer who was in the employ of the Soviet Government for a period of ten months, says of the conditions at the mines in Russia, "The food supply is always short. I have seen miners drop their tools and go home because they were so weak from hunger that they could not continue. The conditions were appalling—the waste, the slackness, the inefficiency, the divided authority, the disregard of human life, the consumptive faces of the workmen, the women performing the most grinding manual labor, the crooked shafts, the frayed cables, the worn-out and obsolete equipment . . . Women greatly outnumbered the men in surface jobs about the mines. They park their babies in the nursery provided for the purpose, and turn to shoveling ore in the open pits, driving sleds, wrestling with heavy machinery and timber, and similar back-breaking tasks to which, in America, we would hesitate to assign the huskiest roustabout . . . Where it takes a hundred rubles to buy a pair of shoes that would sell for five

dollars in the United States, a ruble is not very much. Where a miner is paid only two rubles a day—that chiefly in credit at the store,—a ruble is a great deal . . . Few workers have any rubles to spend. They must exist on what they can get on their food cards at the Communist store; rarely is this anything more than black bread and salt fish; occasionally a little sugar or rancid butter is available. To get served, moreover, entails standing in line for hours and hours; then, when one's turn comes, it is possible, and even probable, that everything on hand has been issued. If a man and his wife are both employed, which is generally the case, the mere problem of finding time to go to the store is often a poser. It would be simpler if they did not have to attend military drill twice a week, but that is absolutely compulsory for both sexes. . . . The patience of the Russian miners, under the staggering handicaps imposed upon them, is past understanding. Continually promised better things that never materialize, they have ceased to hope for anything, except enough bread to keep themselves and their families alive for another day. Forced to work with broken or unsuitable tools, they shrug their shoulders resignedly . . . I pity the Russian people, fed on glittering promises that can never be fulfilled; oppressed and terrorized by a system which could not have been approached for thorough-going cruelty in the days of the monarchy."

One of the last spasms of propaganda censored for sending out of Russia—and, therefore, considered meritorious by the Communist dictatorship—states that although twelve million workers and their families are being fed collectively in the Soviet Union at factory kitchens, public dining-halls and

children's feeding-stations, the drafting of women for industry and their removal from the private kitchen have greatly increased the demand for collective feeding; therefore, it is said that large sums of money will be spent to equip three hundred new factory kitchens and four thousand new dining-halls, so that, within three years, some twenty-five million workers and their families will be fed daily at State feeding establishments. These figures need not be taken seriously, but the news is of interest, as it suggests continued State action to break up Russian family life, put all the women to work, the children in State institutions, and feed and house all the workers, like soldiers in barracks.

The Communists maintain that a man who is well fed, well housed, well paid and well treated loses interest in world revolution and in the triumph of Communism. They do not announce such beliefs, however, to the proletariat; if they did, the ignorant workers would wonder why they should sacrifice; why they should be compelled to develop a martyr complex. It is all right for the Intelligentsia to say, "It is better to travel than to arrive," or "It is better to struggle than to gain," but, if the goal is handy and reachable, the Russian worker, or any other worker, will want it. Why half starve oneself and one's family to send food to foreign lands to people who do not need it, in order to buy machines that do not seem to lighten one's work or give one more usable wages and more happiness, or lift the plane of living? It would seem, according to the theory of the Communists, that if their Social System and their Five-Year Plans win—then they must inevitably, in the ultimate, lose, for as workers get "well fed, well housed, well paid and well treated,"

they will "lose interest in Communism and World Revolution." Hungry and cold, unprotected workers are the raw material on which Communism feeds and builds. Give workers fair wages, permitting them to live as free men on a relatively high and decent plane—with good food, shelter, clothing and some desirable comforts—and such workers become the champions and the prize exhibits of a capitalistic system that Communism is pledged to destroy.

The National League of Americans of Russian origin has appealed to the Committee on Slavery of the League of Nations to include in its work a study of the use of compulsory labor in Soviet Russia. "The entire population of Soviet Russia," says the appeal, "has been placed in a state of virtual slavery and deprived of all human rights. In that country all classes of people, peasants and laborers, as well as scientists and all other intellectuals, are subject to compulsory labor under pain of starvation, imprisonment and even death without trial. No amount of hypocrisy can longer conceal the shameful fact that slavery exists in Europe itself in the twentieth century."

The Communist (Stalin-dominated) Government of the Soviet Union is the antithesis of democracy and of individual human liberty; it is a dictatorship of one unscrupulous, bigoted and arbitrary despot, supported by a very small, but highly-organized, fervid and brutally-fortified group of men, who in turn are held in power by a most exclusive party of zealots that, numerically, are a ridiculously small minority of the people of the Union—some one and a quarter per cent., or less. The present government of Russia is in no sense of the word a government of the people; it is infinitely more of an imperious

and brutal autocracy, more of an absolute and oppressive tyranny, and more of a rigorous and soulless despotism than that of the despicable and frightful governments of any of the old czars, including Ivan the Terrible.

It has been said that the only advantage of the Soviet Government over previous imperial and aristocratic governments of Russia is "that it preaches **WORK** for one and all; demands that all work and, moreover, affords ample opportunity for all to work whether they want to or not." The resolution passed by the Archangel Soviet which says "It is our rule that he who works not, neither shall he eat" is frequently referred to as a terse and laconic expression of the Soviet (Communist) social and economic creed. The policy which demands that a man must work if he desires to eat and to live is being most scrupulously and strictly adhered to—and enforced—in Russia, but the statement that the Soviet Government "affords ample opportunity for all to work" is absolutely and unqualifiedly false, and is made with a malicious intent to deceive. All the upper classes and the middle classes of Russia—the so-called bourgeoisie—all tradesmen, Kulaks, property-minded and educated men, and all who decline to grovel in the muck at the feet of the proletarian god and refuse to sell their souls—both literally and figuratively—for a mere contemptible mess of pottage, not only are given no work to do and no opportunity to obtain work by the government (which is the sole and exclusive official employer of labor in the Soviet Union), but they are peremptorily and openly refused not only permission to work, but the right to work. Whereas it is true that some of this class are convicts and are put to work under armed

guards "for their keep until they die"—which is not for long,—many millions are condemned to death and extermination by the cruel weapon of State-enforced unemployment, and no convict or a deprived, outlawed and disfranchised Russian can escape over the barbed-wire entangling, heavily-guarded and patrolled frontier, for any attempt to escape means a violent death. All Russians, moreover, who are granted by their Communist overlords the great boon of work, are slaves, fettered, and held in the most absolute bondage that the world has ever known, by force and terrorism.

The Soviet State is the sole employer of labor, the sole purveyor of food and of other articles of consumption, and the sole importer and exporter of goods. All workers in Russia are employed by the State and must buy or otherwise receive their sustenance from the State. Workers can be obtained only from Government Boards, whose duty it is to recruit and assign labor. A worker who quits his job without permission is "suspended" for six months—with no pay, food, or shelter, etc., and no chance to get any work elsewhere; he becomes a pariah. A worker who, being unemployed at the time, refuses a job offered is similarly "suspended" and gets similar punitive treatment. All workers are deprived of the privilege of bargaining or of selling their services; they have no voice with regard to wages, or working hours or days—all are arbitrarily decreed by the State. Workers may be transferred from one job to another, and from one district to another, without their consent. Workers who disregard orders, regulations, or discipline are "suspended"; disorganizers are prosecuted criminally, as are those responsible for "delinquencies, for fail-

ure to care for machines, and for spoilage of materials." A worker put on the "black list" of one factory cannot obtain a job of any kind in another factory, or in any other line of work. The State pays nominal wages for labor and receives the money back as payment for consumption goods and in loans which are theoretically voluntary, but actually compulsory. With complete control over production and distribution, the State can and does use food and other necessities of life as a powerful weapon against the non-conforming and the rebellious. All work performed in Russia is exacted by the State from any and all persons of working age, without regard to sex, under the menace of the penalty of withholding food, shelter and the necessities for sustaining life for its non-performance, and to perform this work, the worker does not offer himself voluntarily, but is conscripted, drafted, and compelled by force to serve when, where, and as arbitrarily directed. No labor in Russia is free. All labor in Russia is forced labor.

III.

PEASANT AND PERENNIAL SERF

THE Bolsheviks regarded the peasant as a capitalistic, small operator and a sort of "necessary evil," who must be conciliated, pampered and courted during the period of actual revolution, but later must be forced into a form of life more Marxian, more collective and more industrial. It has been said that some thirteen years ago the Bolshevik Russian Government "endeavored to socialize the three million workers in industry," but Stalin during recent years has been endeavoring, by force and terror, "to compel the socialization of the more than one hundred and thirty million of the peasant population engaged in agriculture."

While the architects of the new Communist social order in effect in Russia (and destined for the whole world) speak constantly of the "Sacred Union of Workers and Peasants," the "Union," if any exists, is a most unequal and peculiar one—the union of a slave to a master, or of a prisoner to a jailer. The Soviet Government is fond of styling itself "A Government of Workmen and Peasants"—a partnership of the hammer and the sickle,—but the peasants have no free voice or hand in government, either individually or collectively, and there can be no partnership between a dictator and an intimidated serf. The manual industrial worker is the theoretical ruler, and the unskilled laborers from factories do not consider peasants as

proletarians. A Muzhik, and even the poorest Bedniak, is considered by urban labor as "bred in an individualistic atmosphere and nurtured on the institution of private property." Even servants of the better-class peasants (Kulaki), or of the bourgeoisie, engaged in manufacturing or trade, are not "true proletarians," even though in the old days they may have been treated as slaves. The factory proletariat, under the direction of a few of the communist intelligentsia, have decreed that the training and old life of a servant, because of his or her intimate association with the bourgeoisie, tends to identify him or her with the one-time ruling class and the acquiring of "a strictly conservative tempo." A poor, poverty-stricken Muzhik, according to the new class-exclusiveness, is not a proletarian, because he may "own" or "want to own" a few acres of land; because he wants his own shack to live in as he pleases, and wants to be his own boss. Because a poor peasant aspires to own a little land, and maybe an animal or a few fowls, he is "property-minded" and cannot be of the "élite." A servant of a Kulak or of an old bourgeois family is not considered a proletarian, because the experienced servant senses differences in class and acknowledges them. A proletarian, it is decreed, must be blind and deaf to all differences caused by breeding, education and wealth. A servant is accused of being of a subservient nature, eating the food and wearing the clothes given by his master or, really, "employer," and living in a house where he has no "rights." What is the difference in the life and status of a proletarian in the ideal communist state and of an old Russian servant? Both

will be fed, clothed and given shelter, provided they work and their work is satisfactory to their masters—in one case, an impersonal and exacting state; in the other, a more interested and human private person.

With the peasant population some four-fifths of the national total, and with the knowledge that Russia never has been and is not naturally an industrial country, it is amazing that an extremely small minority of factory workers, led by unscrupulous and bigoted opportunists of the radical intelligentsia, should have been able to so effectively terrorize and subjugate a people—great in numbers, if not in intelligence.

The overwhelming majority of the Russian people are agricultural peasants. They are not interested in the industrialization of Russia, but they want "Liberty with Land"; they want freedom to own and work some land, to hold and use as they please, in a lawful, human way, a home, one or more head of live stock and possibly a machine, as well as highly desirable items of equipment (in 1926 only 19.4 per cent. of the peasants owned two or more—and of this percentage only one-third owned three or more—working animals). The Russian peasant does not incline naturally to Communism; this claim is as much of a fallacy as that he was "a devoted son of 'Holy Russia' imbued with heartfelt devotion to Czar and Church." The Russian peasant was a rabid revolutionist so long as it was a question of sacking the large estates, robbing the Pomyeschik, or big, landed proprietors, and dividing the land and booty among themselves. He did not, however, take any initiative in formulating

the issues of the civil war. William Henry Chamberlain, in "Soviet Russia—A Living Record and a History," says, "He was rather an object to be propagandized and mobilized, conscripted and subjected to requisition by Reds and Whites." He stood, to some extent, between "the devil and the deep blue sea"; he did not know at times which was the greater evil—the "Whites" with their returning estates and landlords, or the "Reds" with their grain levies and displeasing theories of collectivism. Nevertheless, the peasant had a powerful inner urge and greed for land, stock, and equipment; for ownership of property, and this with a great craving "to be a boss"—even though he had no one but himself (or his family and an animal or two) to boss. Moreover, the leaders of the White Army were the landlords and the owners of property which the peasants wanted for themselves. How, then, could this peasantry satisfy their ambition to own and work this land themselves as free men in their own way, if the "Whites" won the civil war and retained their land and properties?

The decision of the peasantry of Russia in favor of land ownership for themselves and the abolition of landlords tipped the scales against the "Whites" and in favor of the Red Bolsheviks, who were full of promises that they never, for one moment, intended to keep; for all communists, of every shade of Red, are agreed that land must be nationalized, with the collectivization of agriculture, and all private ownership, or "free lance" operations, abolished. After the civil war, the peasants soon became as helpless against the Bolsheviks and the determined policies of the Communists as they had been

against either the oppression of aristocratic landlords or the raids of Tartars in olden days. Calvin B. Hoover, in "The Economic Life of Soviet Russia"—Macmillan Co. (1931), says, "When driven to the wall by unbearable oppression, the Russian peasant will rise, as in the days of Pugachev or of Stenka Razin, and will commit acts of savage brutality which show him as the semi-Asiatic which he is; but a determined government can always drown such risings in blood or still them by temporary and unimportant concessions, or by a combination of both, as has been the Russian custom."

It was with the slogan "Peace and the Land" that the peasants of Russia were finally won over to the cause of the Communists, and it was the peasant support of the Red Bolsheviks which sealed the doom, not only of Czarism and the "Whites," but of the more democratic and liberal parties which might have held or succeeded to real power had they better known the psychology of the peasantry and been well enough organized to win their support. The first act of the revolution, as far as the peasants were concerned, was the expropriation of some two hundred thousand families of the Russian landed nobility in favor of some twenty-five million peasant homesteads; this accomplished fact, which seemed to operate in the interest of the peasants for a time, has, however, brought them no permanent or lasting benefit, economic or otherwise. Some of the seizures of land made by the peasants were conducted peacefully, though cruel and unfair; others were accompanied by violence and murder, and what has been done can never be undone. Calvin B. Hoover says,

"No one realized better than the communists themselves that the peasants did not support the proletariat because of any fervor for the establishment of a socialistic régime. Lenin, therefore, grafted the policy of the Smychka between the proletariat and peasant on Marxianism, and thereby assured the triumph of Communism. In all history there is no more striking proof of the power of the human intellect over the material world than the success of the Communist Party in conjuring into existence an economic and social system . . . which was utterly in opposition to the customs and hopes of the overwhelming mass of the peasant population in a land where the support of the peasant masses was the first essential to success."

Lenin's keen mind and his subordination of honor and principles to ambition, coupled with a devilish policy of opportunism, made the Soviet Russia of to-day. To Lenin and his close followers "the end" always "justifies the means"; lies become a virtue, and treachery is not only defended, but advocated, if it gains a desired objective. Lenin saw that the desire of the peasant for land would have to be satisfied—temporarily—if Communism were not only to win, but even to be born (with the promise of life) in Russia. He held up the Smychka—a term used to express the theoretical community of interest between the industrial worker and the peasant, a sort of union between city and village, and co-operation between the urban proletariat and the rural Muzhik—for the peasants to gaze at with pleasure, as he painted the picture in such brilliant colors that his dishonest opportunist motive was hidden under a daub of words, with their falsely-proclaimed hopes

and promises. Lenin "gave" peasants land, but, subtly and in reality, kept it as the property of the nation, although definite action to nationalize the land was delayed for a more auspicious time when proletarian communism would be stronger and the peasants relatively much weaker. He used the peasants to do "the dirty work" of expropriating and expelling the landowners, but the peasants, in their ignorance, never dreamed that the Bolsheviks would give them land and then later rob them of it; they knew nothing of the "ideals" of the so-called socialistic or communist state, and any talk that later developed of the "nationalization of land" was never understood.

After the civil war, attempts were soon made by the Communists to induce the peasants to form collective farms, but even after many years of persistent, economic pressure and persuasion having been brought to bear (with a vast amount of alluring and believedy convincing propaganda) upon the peasants, it was found, to the intense chagrin of the dictators of the Communist Party, that less than five per cent. of the peasants had been induced to try their fortunes in collective farms. The instinctive sentiment of the Russian peasant in favor of owning and working his own farm is just as strong as that of a French or German peasant, or an American farmer. Only terrorism can change a hundred and thirty million peasants of Russia from capitalism, and the owning of private property, to communism, which for them, individually and as a class, is serfdom.

The Communists do not favor the Kolkhoz or theoretically co-operative type of farm; they much

prefer the Sovkhoz, which is no more controlled, even in theory, by the workers than is a State factory. These Sovkhoz farms are even proudly referred to as "grain factories." Nevertheless, circumstances have forced the Communists to temporarily accede, to some degree, to the peasants' feelings, and the Sovkhoz of the future will be expected to come through the Kolkhoz of the present. Three types of Kolkhoz farms, moreover, are in existence. The simplest form, *Tovarishchestvo* ("comradeship"), is rapidly disappearing; the middle form, the *Artel*, is overwhelmingly the commonest and can be considered as the standard type at the present time. The third type, the *Commune*, is of a far more advanced collective nature, is highly communized, and approaches closely to the Sovkhoz.

It is said that, when the peasants have been asked if they would not willingly enter a Kolkhoz or collective farm, the answer was almost invariably the same; it was heard so frequently and persistently throughout the rural regions that it became almost stereotyped: "In the Kolkhoz, the lazy and the energetic man would be equal in their share of the produce. God created men so that they are all different. The trees of the forest are of unequal size and height. Men also are unequal in ability and output. It is wrong to try to reduce us all to the same level; it is unfair to the industrious and the interested worker."

When peasants have been forced into the collective farms by their Communist overlords—and their further and continued resistance was felt to be useless,—they have frequently exclaimed, "If there

would only be another war! Then they would have to put arms in our hands. If we peasants had arms instead of pitchforks and spades, we would fight and crush the Soviet power!" The general attitude of the peasant throughout Russia was that they "would sooner die" than enter the collective farms and be like "rats in a trap" in the "prison farms" or national "poor farms" of the Communists.

The peasants of Russia are either non-Communist or anti-Communist in mind and inclination. If any power could get the receptive ear, win the confidence of the peasants of Russia and guarantee to them "freedom and the land"—which the Red Bolsheviks and Communists promised and have failed to give,—the peasants would rise and, if armed and officered, would fight against the Communists and the proletarian minority that have enslaved them. The peasants of the Soviet Union desire freedom of property, of speech, of assembly, of the press, of religion; they want a parliament seated by popular elections, and they demand an equitable law code, with justice for all. The ideal of the Russian peasantry in the realm of politics is a democracy which will bring to them all the liberties and opportunities for happiness and success that the farmers of Britain, France and the United States enjoy; in the realm of economics they want to be let alone, to work the ground as their judgment dictates, and raise and sell their crops when and as they see fit; they aspire to be free capitalists, as well as good citizens.

W. H. Chamberlain says, "A peasant once remarked to me: 'After the Revolution there was more freedom; I got land.' To him, freedom meant

not the opportunity to vote for a parliamentary Peasant Party, but the possession of a slice of the landlord's estate." (This peasant referred to the communist policy under Lenin, where the poor peasant was given land and, in 1925, was even urged by Bukharin—for many years editor of the communist official organ, *Pravda* (Truth), but expelled from the Political Bureau of the Party in 1929 and characterized by Sapronov as "that ever-sinning, ever-repenting Magdalene"—to cultivate the land, work hard and "get rich"—as individual operators.) "The identification of land with liberty is a very traditional attitude of mind with the Russian peasantry. It was no accident that one of the revolutionary societies of the nineteenth century called itself 'Land and Liberty.' It is true that most peasants have not been singing any very loud hymns to liberty since the Communist Party went over to its more radical agrarian policy in the winter of 1927-28. To the peasant the pressure exerted to make him sell his grain at low, fixed prices seems quite as definite an infringement of liberty as the extortion of high rent by the grasping landlord of pre-revolutionary days."

Chamberlain also records the passionate comment of a Cossack woman (30 per cent. of the homesteads in this one district, ravaged during the civil war, are farmed by women): "What does the State mean by trying to make us all *bedniaks* (the poorest class of peasants)? We can't all be equal, because some of us will always work harder than others. Let me work as much land as I can with my own arms, and I'll gladly pay rent and taxes to the State for it and sell my crops, too, if I can

get a fair price, and buy some needed goods with the money. But nothing will ever come out of this idea of making us all bedniaks and calling every peasant who is a capable, hard worker a blood-sucker and a Kulak. That sort of thing keeps us poor, and keeps the State poor too."

In 1925, Trotzky and his followers—criticizing Lenin's Nep policy—had raised the cry that "the conquests of the revolution" were "being surrendered to the Kulaks." Stalin ridiculed Trotzky's stand and temporarily assumed a different attitude in true opportunist fashion, but after Trotzky was disgraced and banished (his secretary was killed and his followers punished, "reformed with humiliation," or exiled) a Congress of the Communist Party, at Stalin's dictation, declared for "an offensive" against the Kulak, and since that time any peasant who is successful and raises himself above his fellows in economic return for his labor—branded as "wealth"—must be subjected to heavy taxation and various forms of administrative discrimination. Premier Rykov, at a meeting of the Leningrad communists (December, 1928), said that it was ridiculous to call a peasant a Kulak because he used a metal spoon instead of a wooden one; but he said that this illustration was no exaggeration, for it was being done. "If we consider the peasant who has a radio receiver a Kulak, then for a sewing-machine or a gramophone we should call him a Pomyeschik (a landed proprietor, estate owner, or country squire). If a peasant works the soil well, without the exploitation of others, we burden him with the individual tax; who, then, is going to undertake to work the land well? I don't think there will

be any such idiots who will do this, when they know that for this they will be subject to heavy personal tax, their children will be driven out of school and they themselves will be disfranchised."

The peasants of Russia were told, in substance, by the communists, "We know what is best; you do not; we have plans and they are going to be put into effect whether you like them or not. Either do as we say, conduct your future course of life exactly as we command, and obey us in all things or suffer the consequences." This is a splendid illustration of individual human liberty under Russian communism. Two million members (or less) of the Communist Party subjugate and terrorize some one hundred and thirty million peasant inhabitants of the land; they force this labor to work "under the menace of a penalty for its non-performance," and the conditions with respect to employment most positively are such that "the worker does not offer himself voluntarily"; there is no choice; no expression of free will; no liberty; no alternative. "Work as we say, or die."

The peasants fought the ever-increasing tempo prescribed and the pressure exerted by their proletarian-communist masters toward enforced collectivization with: (1) Indifference with respect to crops and volume of farm products, (2) storing certain "surplus" crops in hiding for their own future use, (3) killing off their cattle and (4) eating more of their own products. The killing of live stock, the reduction of farm yield and, therefore, of evident "wealth," it was hoped would make many a peasant, who might be classified as a Kulak, into a tolerated Seredniak. Pankratov, a member of the

Collegium of the Soviet Trade Commissariat, reported in September, 1929, that the number of big cattle had declined in three years from 106 to 96 million head; the number of pigs from 97 to 82 million, and the number of sheep from 108 to 100 million. The official *Izvestia* (News) (March 31, 1930) accuses the Kulaki of killing their cattle to embarrass and delay the collectivization movement and of further trying to induce the smaller and poorer peasants to do likewise. It is said that in four months (October, 1929-February, 1930) the number of sheep in the Soviet Union declined by 22 per cent. and the number of hogs by 28 per cent. This, it is said, resulted in a temporary glut of meat, soon followed by a shortage, which was reflected in a sharp lowering of the meat ration.

When the Communists commenced to force the peasants into collective farm organizations they were told that, if one Muzhik owned a cow and another Muzhik owned another cow, under the new system the two would own two cows, but the peasant could not see it that way; to his way of thinking, the State would own two cows and he would own none. Moreover, the State was really the urban proletarians, and they were determined to steal his cow, his horse, his pigs, his hens and all his property. Seldes makes the statement that in one agricultural section in one week, after the compulsory plan of collectivism was announced, the peasants slaughtered "33 per cent. of their horses, 50 per cent. of their cows and 60 per cent. of their pigs and hens; the land was flooded with fresh meat: then came the famine in meat."

After a tour of some twelve thousand miles in

the Soviet Union, Henry Wales says, "In the Ukraine and the North Caucasus, I visited dozens of collective farms and saw the terrible conditions existing there, conditions so horrible that even local communist leaders are exhorting Moscow to ease the pressure and let up sufficiently, on the drive for exporting grain, to give the miserable peasants enough wheat, oats and hay for themselves and their live stock. I visited in their homes (their mud huts without even windows) with these peasants and noted their apathy, their listlessness—brought on partly through malnutrition, lack of adequate food . . . their fear that they, too, might be gathered up and shifted off elsewhere as 'colonists' any night. . . . These peasants, thousands and thousands of them, have resorted to 'passive resistance.' . . . In Siberia I saw train loads of exiles being dropped off the railway with their belongings, men, women and children, common-law prisoners, political offenders and Kulaks, to 'colonize' vast new areas in this barren region."

From Rossash, the center of a rich-soil farming area, we hear of the compulsory "collapse of peasant home life" and the relentless pressure being applied by the Communists to win large crops from the ground, with Muzhiks, conscripted or forced into the Kolkhozes, becoming the slaves of machinery—as well as of their urban proletarian masters. Big food mills, industrialized, are in the making, but, meanwhile, "the majority of the area's population appears to be supplied with food sufficient only for a bare existence." An advisory American agriculturist says that "the peasants cannot obtain sufficient nutritious food to keep them in an efficient

working condition," and many are "without boots and necessary clothing." However, the propaganda grinds out its persistent message: "Tighten the belt; sacrifice a little to win much," and we also hear from a dominated foreman, "Things will work out all right. Lenin himself said that we might have to go without trousers for a time."

Stalin's orders for the complete liquidation of the Kulaki, as a class (December, 1929), was one of the most stupid things that this Eurasian despot has been guilty of. No wonder rumor persisted that Stalin had gone mad. The decree was expected to affect five million of the best, most intelligent and most successful peasants, and for three months Russian soil ran red with human blood and frightful atrocities were committed. The very poorest peasants, who resisted the government's attempts to force them into collective farms, were branded as Kulaki. Peasant uprisings occurred, culminating when disaffection began to appear among the troops sent against the insurgent, but generally unarmed (except for pitchforks and spades) peasants. A goodly portion of the officers of the Red Army proved to be the sons of Kulaki, and finally troops refused to fire on the peasants. Quickly, Stalin made one of his characteristic switches. He knew that the Russian peasantry is an immense, inert force which is of tremendous importance negatively; that the peasants are entirely helpless in any positive sense and that they are quite (and pathetically) incapable of working out any constructive program or of effectively fighting for such a program by themselves if such were in existence. Stalin knew that with the Soviet communist pressure slackened, the

peasant would cease to resist the power of government; he, moreover, well knew that the peasants were entirely unorganized, unarmed, and had no program of action and no organization; that they had no plan or object in mind, except a primitive urge to self-preservation. Stalin wrote an article, "Dizziness from Success." He admitted no mistake for himself, but he back-pedaled gracefully; the "liquidation of the Kulaki" was to be carried on without interruption, but more slowly, more moderately, and not in "a mood of exultation and intoxication" as had, he said, been expressed by some overenthusiastic comrades. It has always been the policy of Russian communist leaders to make any move necessary as a "temporary" expedient. It is not a settled policy with them that they adopt, but merely a move to quiet and lull the people into somnolence until the unscrupulous leaders (political racketeers), crazed with power, consolidate their positions and start a fresh advance. Lenin, in his New Economic Policy (N. E. P.) and temporary reestablishment of private trade, said, "It is only a strategic retreat for a further later advance." History proves Lenin's prophecy accurate. Stalin switches quickly from the left to the right, or from the right to the left, but always for a purpose and to achieve what is deemed desirable or that seems necessary at the moment. All shifts are temporary, but they are (each one) designed to strengthen ultimately the Communist Party, the dictator's hold on that party, and, through the mechanism and organization of the party, the entire international movement for world revolution.

Marx predicted the disappearance of the indi-

vidual peasant-producers, but in Russia they exist to-day in more than twenty-five million homesteads. Before the revolution, the peasants of Russia (contrary to prevalent opinion) owned 68 per cent. of the cultivable land, divided into some sixteen million farms. In 1927, Soviet statistics show the peasants "owning" 89 per cent. of the land (an increase of some 30 per cent. in ten years), with a relatively small average tillable area (estimated at some twelve acres) per peasant farm.

There are in Russia to-day both Sovkhozes, or State farms, and various forms of Kolkhozes, or co-operative (collective), farms. Even though the land of the old estates and landed gentry was supposed to have been divided among the peasants in harmony with the promises made by the Bolsheviks, it is significant that the State admittedly owns all the land of the Sovkhozes—originally the largest landlords' estates—and the peasants have never had even a theoretical or imaginary ownership of such expropriated lands. The communists are running the Sovkhozes as State agricultural factories, paying nominal wages in general harmony with industrial plants. The Kolkhozes, on the other hand, are supposed to be a grouping of the once private-owned land of peasants, which is being worked by these peasants under a communist overlord on a theoretical, co-operative basis.

According to official statistics, the Soviet Union in 1928 had 90 per cent. of the pre-war area of farm land under cultivation, with 80 per cent. of the pre-war grain production and only 56 per cent. of the pre-war grain to market, and this with a stated 10 per cent. increase in the population to be fed. If

these Soviet figures are correct, they explain why white bread is not procurable in Russia. They also seem to bear out the statements of the best class of peasants that the communists, in allocating land to them, invariably gave the poorest peasant (often the laziest) the best and most accessible farm land, and the Kulak (the "richest" and most industrious) the poorest and most inaccessible land—often quite remote from a village. By such "just" means, production was materially lessened, for the Bedniak would seldom, if ever, have any "surplus" from his good land, and the Kulak and Speredniak, even with the greatest industry, were restricted or defeated by unkind nature.

Peasant ownership of land and peasant individualistic operation of land are not "socialistic," and Russia, under a Communist government, is still primarily capitalistic, part "state" and part "peasant"—as far as properties and their operation are concerned—notwithstanding, (1) the world-wide propaganda that proclaims Soviet Russia a great communist, socialistic country, and (2) that communist manual factory workers are "in the saddle."

Russian communism under Stalin is not socialism, but can be termed state capitalism, and "state" can here be defined as meaning not a people, but merely a government that controls by force, enslaves and terrorizes a people. As a matter of fact, the control is in the hands of a party consisting of some $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. or less of the population, which, in turn, is controlled by committees, who are further controlled by a working cabinet under the domination of one despot, Stalin.

The Trotzky group of communists have con-

tended that the Russian system prevailing to-day, with its State Trusts and Syndicates, would have to be superceded by a system of more direct State operation before it could even approach the ideal of Socialism. Calvin B. Hoover says, "The system is truly socialistic in the sense of being entirely controlled by the State." If a very small minority of a vast people, actuated by the frenzied madness of the audacious (paraphrasing Maxim Gorki's epigraphic expression "The Sacred Madness of the Brave"), are "the State," or if one arbitrary despot, with assumed dictatorial powers which he fully and, at times, capriciously and vindictively exercises—without any regard to the wishes of the majority and without any consideration whatsoever of human justice or individual well-being,—is "the State," then the Soviet Union may be "truly socialistic." Americans and democratic peoples who believe that men are born equal, are entitled to protection of life and property, to liberty under law, and the pursuit of happiness, and all socialists who believe in social equity with rectitude must of necessity denounce Russian communism as the inhuman, cruel and essentially anti-social system that it is.

The Russian communists are determined at any cost to prevent, in their domain, the growth of a more or less independent and conservative-minded peasantry, such as has generally become the real substance of the so-called capitalistic and progressive nations of Western Europe and America. Their proclaimed policy is to eradicate every semblance of bourgeois vitality; to repudiate and exterminate, if necessary by violence, every sign of any *laissez-faire* operation; to expropriate all private property,

and to absolutely ban every claim to or semblance of individual human liberty.

Lenin's New Economic Policy (Nep), whereas branded by many as "a retreat to capitalism," was merely a typically communistic opportunist switch. It was necessitated by famine and national demoralization. The Nep was inaugurated to keep communism alive in a period of distress and confusion. Foreign capital was invited to Russia and the bait was "foreign concessionaires," but few foreigners—to their credit be it said—were "hooked," and those who were, have since deeply regretted it.

The Nep encouraged the peasant to work his farm and grow prosperous. Requisitions and confiscation of crops ceased, as a general policy, but a land tax was instituted. Private trade and private enterprises were encouraged as "a temporary measure" solely because the communist "ideal" was taking much more time to work out than originally expected. Actually, the Nep was an ingenious plan of Lenin's to voluntarily let go, for the time being, that which he could not possibly have continued to hold, and reduce the pressure against the communists by a partial abandonment of the agricultural and marketing spheres of the economic order to a certain degree of private exploitation, accompanied, however, by a definite concentration upon the "communistic socialization" of industry. Foreign trade was retained as a State monopoly; the original communist theory to abolish the use of money was materially modified (at this time all the banks in Russia had disappeared, and trade was mere barter and exchange of goods); the State Bank was established, with money as a unit of account and a me-

dium of exchange and stabilization of the currency on a so-called gold basis. Lenin well described his Nep policy to his followers as "a step back in order the better to leap forward."

Nepmen were soon made to know that their activities were tolerated only as "a temporary necessary nuisance." Such a one had no constitutional rights; he was virtually a pariah, and was made to know and feel it; for him there was and could be no future, and the Government gradually, at first subtly, and later more openly, made war upon him. Maurice Hindus (a Russian-born American citizen), in "Humanity Uprooted," says, "Most harrowing is the social contumely with which the Russians have saddled the business man. . . . They no longer use the word *Koopetz* (trader) or the word *Promyshlenik* (industrialist) to designate a person engaged in such pursuit. They have coined a new word—Nepman . . . symbol of degradation, object of scorn and contumely! Pariah, social swine! Villain on the stage, villain in the motion-pictures, villain in every-day life! Nepman—label, curse, anathema," and Hindus repeats what the daughter of a one-time successful and relatively wealthy man passionately exclaimed, "I'd rather that my children became bandits than Nepmen. They'd be stood up against the wall and shot, and that would be more merciful than the eternal damnation they would suffer as Nepmen."

Under Stalin's dictatorship, food conditions grew steadily worse, as did the condition of the vast agrarian population. The rupture of diplomatic relations with Britain in 1927 caused a hysterical fear of war in Russia, with probably some hoarding of

food products by the peasants. The communist proletarians accused the peasants of social indifference and congenital laziness, and, ultimately, of working too little and eating too much. The peasant attitude could be expressed—if they had dared to voice it in words—as, “Why should we work hard and have our surplus products, which should be exchangeable for all the things we need, other than food, taken from us by force; with a mere pittance handed to us that fails to provide more than a very small part of our necessities? We are given no incentive to work, so we will only grow food that we need ourselves and will have no surplus for communist proletarians to steal from us.”

While industrial conditions were said to be gradually improving in Russia, the agricultural situation became constantly more menacing. In 1928, although there had been no adverse climatic conditions to interfere with normal harvests, the total crop collection was so low that Russia—the once much-vaunted granary of the world—actually had to encroach on the so-called “untouchable reserves,” import grain, and resort to the general introduction of bread-cards, as the cities and congested districts were threatened still more by “the bony hand of hunger.” This was a crushing blow to the communists, and Stalin felt it keenly as it threatened his, and the Party’s, prestige abroad. After more than ten years of Soviet government, Russia, an agricultural country, was compelled to import grain and ration food. “The communists,” writes Calvin B. Hoover, “felt the need of a personal devil to account for this unlooked-for misfortune that had befallen them. This devil was dis-

covered in the Kulak, who was accused of buying up the grain and holding it off the market, or working it into illicit intoxicants in order to avoid selling it at the fixed government price."

How could the Kulaks be responsible for the conditions existing? Their acreage of land had been cut down by arbitrary communist decree; they may have had more brains and more industry than other peasants, but they had no more land per person. The land law, which prevented the accumulation of anything more than the peasant norm of land in the hands of one person, was a guarantee that there would and could be no growth of the Kulak class. Stalin, in a speech in which he outlined action against the "devil" Kulaks, gave figures which, whether true or false, certainly of themselves refute his own statements and contradict his own conclusions. Because of greatly-reduced acreage, the annual yield of grain on Kulak lands had been lessened 23.4 million short tons, whereas the Serebniki and Bedniki, with greatly increased acreage, taken from the landed estates, the rich proprietors and the old-time "rich" peasants (the Kulaki), had harvested an increase of 27 million tons.

Within the Communist Party a "right" element, led by Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsy, urged that Lenin's earlier policy of coping with famine, reverses and discontent, with some relaxation of pressure, slowing-up of part of the industrialization plan, and with more encouragement of and seeming liberality to certain factors—all of a temporary nature,—be adopted once more. They advocated the development of "light industries" and the importa-

tion of more "consumption goods" in order to alleviate the scarcity of manufactured goods, raise the purchasing power of money which the peasant receives for his crops, and thereby induce the agrarians to expand their tilled acreage and increase their productivity of land and the volume of national crops. Stalin bluntly refused to even consider such a liberal policy, though presented as a typically "communist" temporary measure. He branded the suggestion as an open surrender to the (Kulak) bourgeois and, with heroics, declared that, if followed, "the fate of the revolution would be sealed." He then outlined the plan of "liquidation of the Kulaki as a class," which was promptly put into effect and soon developed into an opportunity for those in power to carry on wholesale expropriation and unrestrained looting. We are told that "the Moscow Committee of the Party declared for the policy of 'the liquidation of the urban bourgeoisie as a class,' and proceeded to thoroughly 'liquidate' the remnants of the Nepmen." Houses and property of the Kulaki and Nepmen were quite generally acquired by thieving and unscrupulous local officials, who both encouraged and were personally benefited by lawless plundering and by the tens of thousands of "mistakes" made in differentiating Kulaki from Serebniki. The economic condition which this Stalin decree of extermination, bloodshed, pillage and exile was supposed to remedy, by diabolical terrorism, steadily grew worse instead of better and would have continued growing still worse, until Stalin's vulgar proletarian throne had tottered, had he not made one of his characteristic changes of front when he found that

relentless, cruel force could not, at that time, attain his desired objective.

As a side-light of how the Stalin brand of Communism works, it is well to recall the drastic Soviet gesture and ridiculous official dénouement made, following the food shortage of 1929 and spring of 1930, and the vicious attempts made by the communists to exterminate the best class of peasants. In the official organ, *Pravda*, of September 25, 1930, we read, "From the Court of the G. P. U.," signed by Menjinsky, President, that "having investigated the case of counter-revolutionary harm organizations dealing with the supply of the population with food products" it has been decided that 48 persons (their names, titles, or positions set forth in detail) are "active members of harming organizations and, as bitter enemies of the Soviet Government, these men are to be shot." Below appears the announcement that all may know and fear: "Verdict of execution carried out." These forty-eight men had nothing whatsoever to do with any of the prime and underlying causes of food shortage in Russia; the Soviet Government knew it; the G. P. U. knew it; Stalin knew it. Yet these men were cruelly butchered as martyrs to Stalin's errors and communist shortcomings, and to impress, intimidate, and still further terrorize the people.

The charge against these forty-eight martyrs was the usual and much-overworked Vreditel'stvo (i.e., a secret attempt to hamper the economic activities of the Soviet Union). During 1930, large numbers of Russian economists, engineers and specialists—some of them with reputations and professional

standing acknowledged abroad—were arrested, charged with counter-revolutionary activities, and many of them were executed. Experts who had planned too low the output of factories under the Five-Year Plan—whose sole offense had been, not a lack of enthusiasm, but merely an excess conservatism—were branded as “harmers,” obstructionists, and, therefore, counter-revolutionists. This accounts for all estimates having been raised on the output of the Five-Year Plan and the emotional campaign of “The Five-Year Plan in Four Years,” as real, technical planners (with bourgeois ancestry and real university training) have been replaced by rapidly “educated” and promoted sons of proletarians, full of Party enthusiasm, but ignorant in the realm of economics.

A professor of engineering was convicted by the Soviets of Vreditel'stvo, or counter-revolutionary activities, on the ground that he “had stated the coefficient of expansion of steel incorrectly” in a text-book which he had written. It was charged that he had done so deliberately, in order “to cause the boilers built by his students to explode.” Such actions by Soviet courts, functioning under the supervision and decrees of the Communist dictatorship, must be set down as ruthless sacrifices to appease discontent, place the cause for persistent faults and shortcomings, and broadcast a warning instilling fear in the minds of those lukewarm to Communism. There is no doubt that thousands of most able and honest men have been murdered in Russia because the Government and its dictatorship have felt the necessity for scapegoats on which to blame failures and shortages. The loss of many

of these men is a great loss to the world and an irreparable one to Russia.

The peasant in Russia has thus far paid the larger share of the communist industrial experiment. Preobrazhensky—a Trotzkyist—suggested that the communists in power should consider the agricultural lands with their peasantry—connected with the soil—as a sort of colony, which the industrial communists must “exploit,” as Marxists conceive that capitalist and industrial countries exploit their foreign or colonial possessions. It goes without saying that this theory of an “extreme winger” within the Party was not only declared “politically inexpedient to proclaim in a country where four-fifths of the population are peasants and agrarians,” but was promptly and solemnly condemned “by bell, book and candle” as rank heresy. Yet the peasants of the Soviet Union are being far more unscrupulously “exploited” under proletarian-Communism than they were under Czarism.

The Communists, with their associated and highly-organized trade unions and proletarian workers, are numerically a woeful, small minority in the Soviet Union. They fear the power of numbers of the land-operating peasants, so in this land of much-heralded “socialism”—where classes are supposed to have been leveled and “the poor” of the people hold the reins of government,—the Communist Party have decreed that the basis of representation in the so-called All-Union Soviet Congress (which convenes every two years for a short time and can do nothing unless so decreed by the Communist dictator) shall be one delegate for every 25,000 voters in the cities and industrial centers, and only one dele-

gate for every 125,000 "voters" in the rural districts. There are two absolutely unjust provisions here; a person, to be entitled to "vote," i.e., hold up his hand in a public meeting under the eye of the dreaded and all-powerful G. P. U., must be considered by "the ruling authority," after personal examination, as "safe"; and after this extreme precaution, and even though the voting and the elected delegates mean practically nothing in the sum total of things, yet the manual worker of the factory has five times as much voice, theoretically, as the agricultural worker or peasant.

This is a positive illustration of the exploitation of an overwhelming proportion of the masses by a highly-organized militaristic minority, fully armed to enforce their will. The peasant in Russia to-day cares nothing about socialistic and communistic "theories," but he does know that his taxes are much heavier than they were before the revolution and that the price relationship of industrial and agricultural products has changed, during recent years, very much to his economic disadvantage. He knows that he does not have to pay rent to a landlord; two-thirds of the peasants know that they pay to the State taxes which are a far greater burden than any rent payments in the old days; all the peasants know that the industrial communist domination exacts from them work and the fruits of their work, bleeds them by depriving them of their crops and products and of their right to obtain fair prices, and further penalizes them by exacting very high prices for all those things that the peasant has to buy to live, clothe and house himself and family, and "carry on."

The Communists of Russia have no "sentimental Tolstovian illusions" in regard to the peasants. They fear the growth of a prosperous peasantry that would develop a "petty bourgeois ideology." They look to France, Germany, and other West European countries, fearing that history may repeat itself and that peasants who, they claim, "benefited" by revolution would fail to continue to support the revolutionary party once they obtained "possession" of the land. The Russian communist, who knows that he has to eat, includes the poorest of the peasants in his plans for the future; but he never even attempts to conceal the fact that, as a manual factory laborer, he is a proletarian—a sort of superior being; that a poor peasant is not as important as a factory worker, and that the Soviet Government is not a dictatorship of the Muzhik, the poorest and most downtrodden class in Russia, but merely a dictatorship of the urban proletariat.

The Bolshevik Communistic Revolution was not a rebellion against unjust and dominating powers that oppress the lowest classes. It was a deep Red revolution of a highly-organized, frenzied and inhuman section of low-class manual labor or proletarians, aimed against all forms of social control and government but that which would place and hold themselves in power to subjugate and rule over all of their fellows, rich and poor, high and low, alike.

The Communist revolution is not even a class revolution, nor is it based on class principles; it is the revolution of the urban lower class aimed at a rural lower class that outnumbers them some ten to one, as well as against all the middle and upper

classes in every walk of life. A small (and numerically an insignificant) minority, by blood, iron and terror, wrest the reigns of government from other groups and then promptly proceed to apply the old principle of "To the victors belong the spoils." The Communists feel that it is but "natural justice" that they, the successful revolutionists and the victors in the civil war, should enjoy the fruits of a conqueror; that they, the urban proletariat, should receive benefits and privileges beyond all other classes, including the poor farm-workers; and, moreover, they demand that the aristocratic rights and privileges that they have usurped shall be of a hereditary nature and better their children in their relation with the children of the conquered and subjugated classes. In Bible parlance, "the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children." This is part of the Communist doctrine in effect in Russia today. Whereas the proletarian offspring of proletarians are the privileged class and sit on the right hand of the Communist god, Stalin, the children of the upper and middle classes, and some of the peasant class, are "deprived," ostracized, outlawed, disfranchised; treated as moral lepers, and not even permitted to be educated.

It has been freely said that "the dictatorship of the Russian proletariat is a dictatorship only in respect to the overthrown capitalistic classes." Such is absolutely false. The public and official statements of Lenin, Stalin, and their henchmen all are explicit on the point that the dictatorship of the communists is in respect to the peasantry, as well as all other rich or poor, educated or ignorant, patrician or plebe, once powerful or impotent.

Lenin wrote, "During the dictatorship of the proletariat, it will be necessary to reeducate millions of peasants and petty proprietors, hundreds of thousands of employees, officials, and bourgeois intellectuals; to subject them all to the proletarian state and to proletarian guidance; to rid them of bourgeois habits and traditions."

The Communists, under the strict discipline of "the Party," which, in turn, is dominated by the Dictator Stalin, rules Russia completely to-day. Not an aspect of life escapes the attention of the Communist or is out of his control; he is everywhere, sleuthing, dictating, criticizing and dominating. A proletarian Communist is the new Dvoryanin—nobleman—the "superior" or "upper-class" man who arbitrarily allocates rights, privileges and enjoyments to himself that he withholds from others. In the villages and the rural districts it is the dreaded G. P. U. (Cheka) who keep the few resident Communists as operating overlords in power, and they do it effectively, although the Communists are outnumbered by the non-Communists a hundred to one, or more.

Russia, under the Soviets, is a lawless and immoral land. The State denunciation of private property has not removed the desire to "possess" on the part of the masses, or even on the part of the Communist leaders. Vegetables, fruits, crops and produce have to be steadily guarded or they are stolen. Every physical possession of individuals or of "the State" must be under lock and key or protected in some effective way, else it disappears. Maurice Hindus says that he has never traveled on a train in Russia but something was

stolen, and when he retired to bed at night he was compelled to buckle to his arm a chain attached to his locked typewriter and suitcases. W. H. Chamberlain says that "there is no surer target for the attention of the street waifs and other pickpockets of Moscow than a fountain pen worn in an outside coat pocket. C. B. Hoover says, "The standard of honesty among Russians is generally quite low, for they are a primitive people. . . . Russians steal quite freely from each other, as when the clerk in the Co-operative steals coupons out of a ration book and when baggage is hooked out of the window from railway-cars." Dishonesty abounds on every hand, and it has been called a land of "petty" thieves only because there is not much to steal or that can be stolen, except from farmers, stores, traders and tourists.

Traders and farmers of the best class are Nepmen and Kulaks, with the standing, as far as Russian justice and law is concerned, of a bootlegger in an American court seeking protection and redress because a case of whisky (an illegal ownership) was stolen from him. All private enterprises and private trade are virtually outlawed in Russia; therefore, their goods are contraband. Human waifs, in amazing and deplorable numbers, roam around the country unmolested and have to steal in order to live. One could, with a great measure of justification, say that private or personal property is virtually contraband in the Soviet Union. That which is "owned" by an individual is given but little recognition in a court of law. A Russian can steal from a neighbor and be lightly sentenced, reprimanded, or even excused; but let him steal

from the State or from any of its operations and institutions, and retribution is swift and drastic—incarceration, persecution, and, if the amount is important and the occasion suggests it, death. The Communists delight in making examples, and revel in terrorism when the well-being of Communism or the Soviet Union is affected. Russians refuse to believe that in any country on earth—and certainly not in capitalistic and property-loving America—can ripe fruit, nuts and vegetables be left in orchards, gardens and fields unguarded; that portable property can (within reason) be left around loose and unprotected; that all possessions need not be continually hidden or locked up, and that people are, or can even be, instinctively honest and cooperate in the protection of that which legally and properly belongs to another.

The aim of the communist is to develop a state in which there will be only workers who have completely lost the peasant psychology; who have no desire for land or private property, or for individual freedom of action and of responsibility. The Communist Party cannot consider the peasantry as a permanent element in what they term "a socialistic state"; the peasant, to survive, will be forced to become a proletarian. The Communist Party has never concealed its intention to eventually destroy the peasant as a class, just as it has been destroying the Kulak—the highest class of peasants—during recent years.

The policy of the communists in their campaign to eradicate the peasant class is, even for them, a particularly vicious and unscrupulous one, as well as essentially dishonest in both its conception and

operation. The communists fear the peasants as a class, for, as the rural element and agriculturists have a numerical strength some tenfold that of the so-called proletariat, their latent power is appalling, as well as disquieting, to the industrial communist. It was therefore decreed that the peasants should be split up into three classes: (1) Kulaks, or prosperous peasants, to be fought at every turn, "liquidated," or exterminated; (2) Seredniaks, or middle-class peasants, branded as an unstable and unreliable class (from a proletarian standpoint) that requires watching; (3) Bedniaks, or the very poor, who are regarded with some degree of tolerance and considered as possible allies of the ruling proletariat—when and as forced into submission by proletarian power and terrorism, and as educated by communist propaganda. In the heat of the civil war, Lenin stated—with some moderation, because of conditions of the moment—what was, has been, and still is (without variations of emphasis) the agrarian policy of the Russian communists: "Reach an agreement with the Seredniak, lean firmly only on the Bedniak, and never for a moment stop or ease up the struggle with the Kulak."

The Soviet Government has created, stimulated and developed class warfare in Russia among the rural population. All peasants have found themselves registered as one of the three classes. In sections where there were no Kulaks the peasants were still graded and divided by the authorities into the three classes—for class distinction to foster class warfare was arbitrarily decreed and demanded by the dictator. The plane of living is so low in Russia

that if an American, Englishman, German, or Frenchman had been required to differentiate and place individuals or families in the specified rural classes, then all the peasants in an average section and all the people in the average Russian village, it is conservative to say, would have been classified as Bedniki without doubt or hesitation. The communists, however, worked on jealousies and grudges; they demanded and instigated inquisitional methods; they encouraged village politics of a depraved order, and the "Committee of the Poor" of the villages, working as sleuths with and for the local Soviet, set the brand of ignominy upon many a man whose crime was the mere accusation that at some time in the past he had hired a man to work for him, or had loaned a neighbor money, seed, grain, or a work animal. Such a man was therefore solemnly, but with apparent satisfaction on the part of the "authorities," stigmatized as a Kulak. He was given "the brand of Cain" and henceforth was subject to enormous taxes (40 per cent. of his exceedingly meagre income), deprived of electoral rights, i.e., disfranchised, denied the privilege of sending his children to any school beyond the primary, and labeled, moreover, as an enemy of the Soviet State.

The Soviet Union, as dominated by the Communist Party, is a cruel and inhuman, as well as vindictive, state. A peasant was fined for withholding grain, and, as he could not pay the money-payment imposed, his house was confiscated and sold and he was declared a Kulak and an enemy of the Soviet power. A married son, living with his own family, in his own cottage, who, in proper filial spirit, sheltered his father—after the old man's home had been

forcibly taken from him,—was notified by the authorities that he would not be permitted to house his old father; that he must be turned out, and if this was not done immediately the son himself would be cast forth and “deprived.” This is not one isolated case; it is the law, generally followed throughout Russia. Another peasant was branded as a Kulak and shot on the charge of hoarding and withholding. A son, who was a member of the Communist Party, was “requested” to sign a statement approving of the execution, in order to somewhat appease the indignation of the old man’s neighbors. When the son replied that he knew none of the facts and could not sign such a statement without going to his old home and personally investigating the matter, he was arbitrarily dismissed from the Party and outlawed. In the Shakhta trial of 1928, and also in the trial of the eight technicians in the autumn of 1930, a son publicly repudiated his father and asked that he be given the full penalty of the law—death—for betrayal of public trust. Communism is certainly “breaking up the family” in the Soviet Union, as decreed by the ruling powers, and with it filial affection and loyalty, together with a feeling of common humanity, are rapidly disappearing.

The Kulak, or upper-class peasant in Russia, still remains earmarked for “liquidation as a class,” which means elimination and extermination. His “crime,” considered unforgivable by the Communist, is that he had capitalistic ideas—he wanted to make money, and he was willing to work hard and intelligently to do it. The Kulak was the most industrious and sober, self-respecting and ambitious

of the peasants, the most progressive and with the most initiative. He obtained a small, but decent, house, some live stock, and possibly a little machinery or mechanical equipment. Gen. W. N. Haskell says, "He would have been considered a poor wretch in the United States, but as his head lifted above the mass level it was cut off." A farmer who, by hard and intelligent work, conquers the soil and does fairly well in making a living is generally considered, in all lands, a great asset to the country. In Russia, the order has been given for his destruction, and it is being ruthlessly carried out—slowly now, but surely.

Although there are about a million members (approximately one-half) of the Union of Communist Youths who are peasants, it is significant that but very few are ever admitted to Party membership. It is decreed by the dictator that peasant members are not wanted, and the percentage of rural and village members in the Communist Party must be kept very small and unimportant. The peasants are not of the favored class or of the "chosen people"; they are not of the "noble and exclusive" proletarian body. The peasant, therefore, receives no ration book and no priority privileges or favors of any kind. Food must be sent to the cities from the agricultural regions of the State whether the peasants have a surplus or not; it must be collected forcibly from the farmers, even if the country folk and the inhabitants of the villages starve to death. Even rural local Communists are threatened with arrest if they do not supply the industrial centers with meat, grain, and other desired farm products. It is of vital importance that the Communists and

urban proletarians be fed; what happens to the peasants is of little import to the industrial workers and to the Party—provided the “élite” do not suffer the pangs of hunger or become too materially inconvenienced.

The Commissariat of Finance of the U. S. S. R. has reported that for the purpose of taxation about 35 per cent. of the peasant population are considered Bedniki, 61 per cent. Seredniki, and some 4 per cent. Kulaki. With the Bedniki exempt from taxes, additional burdens are being placed upon the Seredniki who, as classed to-day, form the majority of the peasant population.

The communist plan to divide the peasants into classes, with varying privileges and different rates of taxation, has, as expected, caused much discord. The status of Bedniki—the poorest—is generally deemed, for self-protective reasons, the most desirable of all, since they are exempt from taxes and are looked upon with some degree of toleration by their proletarian overlords. This fact is indicative of the real “regeneration” of Russia under a so-called Socialistic Communist Government. The mediocre not only incline, but even struggle to become the worst and to be officially classed as the worst. There is no incentive to prosper. Ambition is killed; success is an evil that must be punished.

Notwithstanding all the efforts of the Communist Party to light and fan the fires of internal strife within the peasant class, there still exists a pronounced measure of solidarity among the villagers and rural agriculturists, and they persist in preserving and presenting more or less of a united front to the industrial proletariat. The peasants have a seri-

ous grievance against the communists in power, because of the great disparity between the money they receive for their agricultural products and the buying power of this money in manufactured goods. The divergence between the prices for farm products paid the peasant and the price that the peasant has to pay for factory-made goods is called the "scissors" in Russia. Moscow statisticians say the scissors are now nearly closed; the villagers say that they are as wide open as ever. The peasants care nothing for index numbers; they are not interested in "official" reports and proletarian "proofs." They know only one thing about, and care for only one phase of, economics, and that bears directly and solely upon this one question: "What do I get for my farm products in money, and how far will this money go in buying me the clothes, supplies and equipment that I and my family need?" In other words, "What is the exchange value of my wheat, oats, hay, or cattle?"

A peasant said to a Fellow of the Social Science Research Council in the Soviet Union, "Before the war I received the same price in rubles for a sack of potatoes which I receive now. But I must sell more than twice as many potatoes now as I did then in order to buy a pair of boots—and such boots! Boots which I bought before the war would outwear three pairs of the boots sold to-day." In this connection it is worthy of note that the much-vaunted Russian "economical" distributing system does not deliver to stores accessible to the vast percentage of peasants and sell to such consumers at anywhere near the prices charged at the large proletarian buying centers. The peasant feels that he is being discrim-

inated against in favor of the urban factory worker—which he is and always will be under Communism of the Marx-Lenin-Stalin brand. He resents this condition primarily because it affects his buying power of absolute necessities (he knows nothing of luxuries, or even comforts). He is sullenly conscious that he is being made poorer and driven closer to destitution, for there has been a pronounced diminution of the purchasing power of the money he receives for his farm products, and he rightly considers the Soviet Government entirely responsible for this condition.

The Russian peasant had been led to believe that, with the overthrow of the Czarist Government and the defeat of the aristocratic and capitalistic land-owning and propertied "Whites," there would be no more rent to pay and that all taxes and levies made upon him would be of the past. Communist propaganda posters claimed that the peasants had been freed of a rent burden of 350,000,000 rubles per year. The peasants rejoiced, for a while, at this good news, but not for long; they soon discovered that communist claims and actual facts are very different things. What they saved in rent they more than paid in taxes, direct or indirect; and what they needed in equipment, supplies and fertilizer they could not buy, as they had neither money nor credit, and there was no landlord's stock and no government agency available to borrow from and pay back gradually from crops.

From the time that the Bolsheviks came definitely into power and began to subtly repudiate their "campaign promises" the peasants of Russia have had grievances. The ownership of land is the

prime sore point, followed by forced grain levies, confiscation of crops and arbitrary price-fixing. W. H. Chamberlain writes, "Practically all the peasants with whom I talked in the course of a trip through Ukraine and the Don Region, in the summer of 1928, complained that they had been compelled to buy bonds of a peasant loan and to pay in the guise of so-called self-taxation, which, however, had no voluntary character, a sum equal to about 25 per cent. of the regular agricultural tax." Any money paid the peasants for crops (or, as a matter of fact, any wages paid any labor in the Soviet Union) is considered fair prey for government onslaughts through assessments, taxes, compulsory "voluntary" subscriptions to bonds, membership dues, arbitrary donations to phases of the communist cause, etc. The term "self-taxation" is a typical communist and most dishonest gesture—deliciously ironical. Imagine an impoverished Muzhik voluntarily taxing himself and putting his pitiful mite into communist coffers and into the hands of his proletarian oppressors!

An American newspaper correspondent in Europe, well posted on Russia from personal experience, says that Stalinism to-day "is not lovely, nor is it (outside of the inner circle of the benefited and pampered), in Russia, of good repute." It is designated as "ant-heap morality, and the devil take the hindmost," but this is unfair to the ant. "An ugly, harsh, cruel creed, this Stalinism, flattening and beating down, with, so far, no more than a hope or promise of a subsequent raising up." All Communist hopes are vain; and promises, lies.

The failure of the communists to deal correctly,

or, at least, intelligently and with some measure of equity coupled with common sense, has threatened the success of the Five-Year Plan. The communists had always figured on Russia being an agricultural country, and a shortage of food under normal climatic conditions was never considered, even as a vague possibility. The Soviet Government had banked heavily on the resumption and pronounced extension of grain exports to pay for the machinery needed to enable them to make Russia an industrial, as well as an agricultural, nation and independent of the whole world, in a militaristic sense, through the production of its own armaments and munitions of war.

"Perhaps the most definite lesson that can yet be drawn from the test which Socialism has received in Russia," writes W. H. Chamberlain, "is that the mere abolition of private capitalism does not automatically make possible a substantial improvement in the living conditions of the masses of the people. Some evils which ardent socialist orators in other countries attribute entirely to the capitalist system, such as congested housing and unemployment, exist in Russia in quite sharp forms; the new system has not provided any immediate remedy for them." (The revolution is already some fourteen years old.) "The ill-managed Bureaucratic Trust (of the Soviet Union), which puts out defective goods at high prices, and the negligent Co-operative, which allows its cashier to run off with the funds and stores its potatoes next to leaking kerosene tins, can be just as much a plague to the consumer as the grasping monopoly or profiteering middleman under capitalism. In short, the magic Marxian

formula of nationalizing the means of production has not, by itself, proved capable of abolishing poverty and want."

Calvin B. Hoover says, in substance, that living conditions were worse in Russia during the past year than at any time since the great famine and the inauguration of Lenin's Nep. Millions of the population are seriously undernourished and, in some sections of the country, famine conditions have been approximated. The Communist policy favors the urban at the expense of the rural regions, and cities have priority over the smaller towns, with Moscow, the center of government, obtaining pronounced relative advantages over every other large congested section. There is a shortage everywhere of fats and meats, and of almost everything except black bread, of which the supply is fairly adequate. At present, the standard of living of the proletarian worker, in terms of food, clothing and shelter, is, in some respects, worse than during Czarist times. The standard of living of the peasant and villager is distinctly worse than before, and this is true to an even greater extent in the case of the old "white collar" workers in general. The average standard of living of all the inhabitants of Russia is inferior to that of Czarist times. The income which has been taken from the "exploiting classes" has not as yet operated to the benefit of the exploited classes who despoiled them. Sherwood Eddy says that whereas bread (black) is plentiful at the government stores "they are short of almost all other supplies of foodstuffs and clothing. The result is long lines or queues of patiently-waiting people for the daily, insufficient supply of most necessities. They are

short of meats, fats, butter, eggs, milk, sugar—almost everything.”

The average standard of living in Russia, under Communism, will probably never reach the level of that of the most progressive democratic and so-called capitalistic countries and will undoubtedly keep far below that of the United States. It is not in the cards to be otherwise. W. H. Chamberlain says that things which would be regarded as intolerably bad in America, England, or Germany are borne with endurance in Russia. The ideal and the ultimate, as visualized by the proletarian communist, is a standard that would be not only frowned at, but repudiated with drastic action by the American worker. Simple, plain food; communal housing, and plain, standardized clothes, which is the goal of communist effort, in terms of standard of living, are what America gives her convicts and malefactors—not her free citizens.

It is now approaching fourteen years since the October Revolution of the Bolsheviki; Russia is still a land of violence, and is still suffering and continuing the revolution. It is a people not only at war with the world in the realms of (1) political and social ideas, and (2) economics, but it is at war with itself—a civil war, with the armed minority in power, fighting to compel a subjugated, vast majority to conform or be exterminated. Violence today in Russia, with its associated terrorism, is inseparable from its much-vaunted Communism.

It is said by competent, unbiased authority, experienced with life in Russia, that quiet and tranquillity, peace and security are unattainable, for the key-note of life in the Soviet Union is struggle, in

an atmosphere of strife and distrust, and any individual who stands aloof is a marked man. "Life is so bitter and so oppressive that one feels as though passing from darkness to light when one crosses the Soviet frontier and leaves Russia behind." Kuibyshev (head of the Supreme Economic Council), in an address (January, 1930) on the subject, "Those who are not with us are against us," broadcast as propaganda, emphasized the fact that the Soviets would not tolerate lukewarmness, indifference, or a "bystander" attitude, but demanded ardent and active supporters, and he who stands apart, stays away, or withholds his personal contribution to the cause must suffer either suspicion or contempt—the former means the attention of the G. P. U., and the latter means being forced out of existence.

Although the "October" Revolution—actually Nov. 7, 1917—gave to the peasants of Russia—who represented more than four-fifths of the population—not only strong hopes, but a definite Bolshevik promise of "peace and the land" if the Red Proletarian Revolution were successful, his hopes have not been realized, and proletarian—communist—Bolshevik assurances have proved, as usual, insincere and meaningless, being of an "opportunist" nature, with the end justifying the means even if "the means" meant the repudiation of all honesty and ethical principles. The World War was followed by the revolution, then the civil war, and more recently the class war, waged in the country and villages, aiming at the breakdown of peasant morals and solidarity; it has been truly said that of all these conflicts and turbulent periods, "the

class war in the villages . . . has probably caused more sheer human misery than any of its predecessors."

The Soviet régime was founded on the reddest branch of terroristic Red revolutionists, upon cruel, bloody force and fear, and it continues in power through the same expenditure and persistent threats of merciless despotic power. It is a land of class warfare where, in addition to the upper and middle classes, the great majority of the lowest class are relentlessly persecuted and exploited by a small minority of the same general lower class. The conflict between the peasants and the urban proletarians calls to mind Trotzky's theory of "permanent revolution." The G. P. U. function in Russia to-day, like the Inquisition in Spain and other countries, hunting, torturing and exterminating heretics, only the G. P. U. have a professional and highly-organized and experienced army of approaching half a million men in their "intelligence and protective," terroristic police organization, and a heretic in Russia is not restricted to a religious belief, but to any and all strong differences of opinion in any phase of politics and economics.

If Russia could be given a chance to vote in a free and fair election to-day for Sovietism, or for a return of the old Czarist régime, with all its hideous faults and oppression, the vote, primarily because of the peasants, would be overwhelmingly against the Soviets. Stop the forced official propaganda, make the press of Russia free, remove the strangle-hold of the Communists from the throat of the people, offer the Russian people of all classes, peasants, proletarians and bourgeoisie, a sound, democratic

constitution, and, after a period of free breathing and adjustment, a few millions of desperate, selfish Communists and their favored proletarians—possibly five or six million in all—would stand forth alone, a woefully small, but ruthless, inhuman minority, opposed to the interests and wishes of the entire Russian people.

Communism in Russia is being forced upon a people very different from Anglo-Saxons or the inhabitants of the more progressive and democratic countries of Western Europe. The average Russian is pathetically backward, primitive, undeveloped, and of an agricultural and semi-Oriental people, accustomed not only to domination and a very low plane of living, but to oppression and tyranny. The Russian is perfect raw material for Soviet rule, as he readily becomes regimentated, and, as Sherwood Eddy says, "the best Communist, like the best soldier, is unthinking and obedient."

It is amazing that any people should have tolerated what the Russians have experienced during the last seventeen years and still continue to take the punishment and endure the suffering. If the Russians were less Asiatic (China has suffered for an even longer period than Russia) and more European, their country would have been tranquilized many years ago and placed under a strong government that would at least have endeavored to operate with some measure of equity while granting to all people substantial liberties.

The Russian expresses the qualities of semi-Oriental fatalism, passivity, lethargy, and the inevitable browbeaten and subjugated reaction from persistent repression. An overwhelming percent-

age of the Russians and practically all of the peasant class, apart from occasional wild and planless outbursts when goaded into desperation, it has been well said, "are rivaled only by the Chinese coolie in their ability to bear the misfortunes which an inscrutable Providence sees fit to inflict upon them." Domination, exploitation, despoilment and serfdom all mean a heavy "cross" to the Russian Muzhik that he must bear; and he cares little whose hand it is that oppresses and torments him—the Tartar hordes, the Czarist landlords, or the proletarians who live in the city and brand him as a Kulak as they confiscate his few possessions and drive him into exile or to death; all are one and the same to him.

The Russian peasants say, "We are a dark people"; their life is dark with poverty, oppression, suffering and dread. They used to speak thus of themselves, expressing a sort of hopeless, fatalistic resignation. Now they say it more bitterly; they had recently been encouraged to hope for liberty, land, food and betterments, but once more they sink down, this time disillusioned, and they are sore and resentful, feeling that their condition could and should be improved.

Maurice Hindus tells of hearing a Communist chairman of a local soviet, who was a fervid orator, harangue the people of a backward village off the banks of the Volga and expatiate on the achievements of the local administration. From the fringe of the audience an elderly Muzhik, barefooted, bare-headed, with a flowing beard, and in a dirty linen shirt, raised his arms high and said, in a protesting, loud voice of hopeless despair: "Words, words, only words! All for the benefit of the foreign visitor!

Just showing off! Look at me, Inostranetz, I am the truth, the sole, putrid truth in this beastly land. I am sixty-five years of age. The Soviets did give me land, but what shall I do with it? Can I eat land? I have no horse, and what can I do on land without an animal to work? In the old days we had a czar, landlords, exploiters, and yet I had a horse and could buy another horse if mine died, and boots, too, and the calico I needed. Now there is no czar, there are no landlords, there are no exploiters, and yet—no horse, no boots, no calico, nothing. Remember that, stranger."

It is well to bear in mind that "time fights on the side of the Soviet Government," and the Communists are thoroughly cognizant of this great factor, which is their greatest ally. A new generation is growing up that knows nothing personally of Czarism, of the old days, of the rest of the world outside of Russia, or even of the World War. Youth is being "educated" and inculcated with the "virtues" and superiority of Communism beyond that of any other political and economic system; impressionable children, from infancy up, are being inoculated with the virus of Communism that takes the place, in a Christian and democratic land, of religion and home, God and parents. The Octobrists, a sort of social and political kindergarten to develop proletarian class-consciousness, are organized and form child communists, 8 to 10 years of age; then there are the Young Pioneers, 10 to 16 years of age—a sort of Boy and Girl Scout organization that develops and disciplines, kills individualism, and promotes the desired collectivist group spirit. The Union of Communist Youth and the Komsomolka (young girl

communists), from 14 to 23 years of age, are not only trained to be rabid communists, but ardent warriors for the cause; they are used as a sort of light cavalry in Russia to-day and as "shock troops" at times where enthusiastic loyalty and the spirit of self-sacrifice are needed in the industrial and agricultural fight against Russia's natural backwardness. The conscripted youths in the army are taught Communism fully as much as the bearing of arms, and the State tolerates no competitive medium of any kind whatsoever to operate openly or subtly in the Soviet Union, in the field of education, or in any associated realm, such as religion, social orders, etc.

The time factor operates to the advantage of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party in another way. It is said that the constant dropping of water will wear away a stone and that steadily-maintained pressure wearies and lessens resistance, but Dostoevsky, the Russian novelist (1821-1881), who knew his fellow countrymen, said, "Man is base; he can become accustomed to anything." That is an unfortunate racial characteristic; the Russian is used to oppression and expects it; if given some livable amount of food and some sort of shelter, like a slave, he will passively conform; if nothing dramatic occurs to awaken and excite him, he will more or less automatically exist, "accustomed to anything," no matter how low or mean.

That peculiarly Soviet institution, the queue, with its long lines waiting for rations, its awful time waste, with its inefficiency, humiliation and injustice, is definite proof that the Russians will not only tolerate the unusual and the unnecessary, but will become "accustomed to anything." With all sorts

of food available for home consumption, the docile, stupid Russians stand in line, hour after hour, for limited rations, while the Government arbitrarily forces the food products, much needed at home, over the border into foreign lands that do not want them, and then, under an established policy of "sell at any price," sacrifices them by "dumping" to obtain a little real gold, or its equivalent credit. "No other people," it has been well said, "would endure the inconveniences and hardships of the Soviet system of rationing. The Russian people, however, have had to accustom themselves to it, and it has now become so much a part of every-day life that it is possible that it will be continued indefinitely, even if the shortage of food, which originally gave rise to it, should be successfully liquidated. Russians, unfortunately, have notoriously short memories for trouble."

Occasionally, however, a worker who has known other days can be tactfully coaxed to express himself to an American or some other "safe" foreigner (but never to a fellow Russian, for any of them may be spies). The general line of such remarks is invariably: "How long are we going to be robbed of the fruits of our hard labor? How long are we to suffer discomforts and humiliation? Why are we of this generation, and in our prime, worth less than those to come? Why should we be robbed and starved so that a future Russia may have big factories and big farms, with a big army to become a great power and make all other nations like we are now?" And the agricultural laborer adds, "Why are we tortured and oppressed? Why do the proletarians descend on us like locusts and seize our

crops? Why are we driven to work hard and get nothing whatever for it except abuse, distrust and persecution? We want money now, clothes and food. We are not interested in sacrificing and being deprived of necessary things in order to build big barns and dairies, with steam heat, for cows."

When Albert Muldavin ("The Red Fog Lifts") ran into difficulties leaving Russia, because of exit visa requirements, he talked with a peasant near the border who was amused at the American's concern over his enforced, but short, delay: "Lose a day! What is a day? We have lost years and are still losing them, but one day more and you will be a free man. Gladly would I wait a year if I knew I could get away from here. Why should I be satisfied to stay here and work like a beast, plow, plant, harvest, for what! for whom!—to deliver them (the proletarian Communist overlords) the fruits of all my toil and take in exchange some paper rubles? How many of these rubles do I need to buy a decent piece of cloth, or a pair of boots; then, what will I have left?"

The communistic proletariat, with cruel, merciless hearts, and hands steeped in blood, are sitting upon the bound, recumbent body of the Russian people, but their victory has not made them happy. They are distraught, suspicious and apprehensive. There is a general air of irritation, of ill-feeling, of a more or less repressed anger, and a sense of tension permeating "the glorious and free proletarian dictatorship." Life in Russia is hard—even for the élite; it is not pleasant; it is not satisfying. Possibly the barbarians lifted to power are beginning to reap that which they have sown; an abun-

dant harvest of misery, in harmony with the eternal moral law of undeviating compensation, should at some time and in some way be their punishment for violating the universal laws of God, man, and nature.

IV.

THE "INTERNATIONAL" GOAL OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM

TO be a good Communist in Russia one must be an adept in switching, a good lightning-change artist, and be able to turn quickly from left to right and from right to left in a "follow your leader" game. We think and talk much of freedom of expression and freedom of thought, but in Russia not only are these attributes of individual human liberty tabu, but men must conform and kotow to the dictator's capricious, arbitrary, or opportunist decree and, without any hesitation, publicly deny their real thoughts and feelings. No one in Russia dares to oppose the Communist Party and its dictator in any way. To live, one must be an opportunist, as is the despot in power, but it is necessary to let the dictator decide whether black is black, white, or gray, and then enthusiastically give tongue, as one in a supporting and worshiping chorus, that the dictator is right—and could not be other than right.

Lenin's course was like that of a vessel under canvas, sailing close-hauled on the starboard tack and changing to the opposite, or port, tack—with an apparent, definite and evident change of direction and seeming change of goal,—but, nevertheless, still progressing, against head winds, toward the desired port. The policy of the opportunist is one of switches and seeming changes of heart, mind, or motive, but, as Lenin said, "in Communism all

retreats are merely temporary setbacks," due to unexpected, heavy resistance, and are ordered so that aggressive and combative forces can be recuperated, strengthened and better organized for a future advance. There is no compromise in Communism—no concession. Ultimately, the party is determined to achieve their entire objective, but in the meanwhile they (the board of strategy under the domination of the "man of steel") will switch, change, retreat, and bargain; make use of their gullible enemies, and even organize, actuate, or motivate capitalistic forces so that they senselessly and disloyally fight, for the proletariat, the battle of Communism—which seeks to destroy democracy, individual "rights," protection and freedom, majority rule by secret ballot, religion and the home, as well as private property rights.

The course being traveled toward Communism in Russia is enough to make any observer, diagnostician, or historian dizzy, bewildered, and very much disgusted. There is not a straight line in it or anything "straight" about it, and the zigzagging is brutal, as well as arbitrary. The Communists call their switches and changes, their retreats and advances, their hard, arbitrary and cruel decrees, and their soft and "friendly" co-operative gestures to their non-communist enemies all expressions of military strategy and executive genius in the economic or political field.

Lenin made the prophecy that capitalistic countries would assist the Communists, not only to hold power in Russia, but to spread Communism over the entire world. One of his potent statements should be hung on the walls of many of our busi-

ness offices and "go-getter" industrial institutions in America, and should be, even at this late date, given the poignant consideration it deserves at Washington: "The capitalists will sell us the spades with which to bury them." In a text-book prepared by Ilin for Russian school children we read that foreigners will sell machines and other needed things to Russia because we (the foreigners, and particularly the arch-capitalists, the money-mad and childish Americans) want buyers of our product and love money so much that we will, in our short-sightedness, sell even to our enemies and to the destroyers of our civilization, our culture and our political institutions.

When the Five-Year Plan was inaugurated in Russia, it was known and admitted that it could not succeed without the help of capitalism, but the wily Russian leaders were positive that capitalism was so materialistic and rapacious, and the principle of money-making so intrenched in the institutions and governments of foreign democratic countries (particularly in America), that for profitable trade of the moment capitalism would sell its soul—if it had any. Apparently Russian Communists have gauged the situation correctly, and American industrialists have swallowed the bait dangled before their lustful eyes—blind to the demands of patriotism; and our legislators have been so pathetically gullible and have fallen, in their colossal ignorance, so hard for Russia's fervid propaganda about her "fascinating human experiment" that they have confused the hell, the destructive, lawless force, and the diabolical threat she actually is with

some "milk and honey" Utopia they had dreamed of.

Russia is the greatest propaganda mill of all time, and she is functioning to-day as the greatest, most immoral and most unscrupulous advertiser in the world. Nothing is permitted to come out of Russia uncensored; Moscow is the world's greatest fiction plant and producer of malicious falsehoods and "inspired" fairy-stories; and foreign correspondents either function as gullible or controlled tools of the Communists—and as such are fed with censored "news"—or they are escorted over the border. George Seldes—a real correspondent and a patriotic American of character and action—smuggled out of Russia a memorandum, to the 35 newspapers which took his service, in which he said, "Truth is not a factor taken into consideration; the standard for censorship in Russia is whether the influence of the dispatches will help or harm Russian policies." (Page 160, "You Can't Print That").

Walter Lippmann, in "Liberty and the News," said, "True opinions can prevail only if the facts to which they refer are known; if they are not known, false ideas are just as effective as true ones, if not a little more effective." Soviet Russia has a mania for publicity. The Communists are sure that "it pays to advertise" and keep Russia and the Five-Year Plan being talked about and in the foreground of interest—even if there is nothing real, worth while, or true that they consider "safe" to say. Russia is a hothouse and an incubator for false news, for expressing and spreading false ideas; everything sent out of Russia, and that can be sent out of Russia, is inspired official

"copy," prepared by the authorities for the digestion of capitalistic people. There is no "news" in Russia except those doings which the censors sanction and pass. All that comes out of Russia is propaganda, raw or cooked. No foreign correspondent can do any free writing with a detective at his door and his copy expurgated or destroyed without explanation.

Eve Garrette Grady concisely tells us what is well known by all observant residents of Russia. Whereas there are (according to official figures) 257 large- and 1,100 small-town newspapers, with several thousand factory bulletins (called wall papers) printed in the Soviet Union, "to read one of these news sheets is to read them all. . . . Every item which appears in print in Russia is an official statement. . . . The Soviet press is concerned only with instructing the people of Russia in the correct ways of thinking about the government; its only purpose is to mold public opinion to the Communist point of view and, at the same time, put over the Five-Year Plan. The newspapers of Russia are nothing more or less than the mouthpieces of the Communist Party—that small per cent. of the population that has decided how the great majority shall live."

"It is a well-known law of psychology," says W. H. Chamberlain in "Soviet Russia," "that if a person is told something about himself often and insistently enough he is quite likely to begin to believe it. The same observation holds good for a class; and ever since the revolution the Russian working class, by every source known to propaganda, has been indoctrinated with the ideas that

it is the salt of the earth, the ruling power in the country and the vanguard of the international revolutionary movement. This is a fact of enormous significance in attempting to estimate the hold of the communist leadership on the proletarian masses."

Throughout the entire Soviet Union, propaganda overwhelms truth, and buncombe reigns supreme. There is no free discussion of any honest type in Russia; no "news," unless it be censored and handed by the authorities to the press; no statistics, unless they be Soviet-prepared, Soviet-doctored, or Soviet-falsified and Soviet-endorsed. Russia is governed and dominated and her people are held in abject subjection by violence, terrorism and buncombe.

"Just as the Russians eat by order, so they think by order, especially the younger element," says Gen. W. N. Haskell (Chief of the American Relief Association, 1921-23). "No one under thirty can remember anything but war, revolution, famine and socialism in Russia. In the schools, education starts along carefully-prepared lines; the books, magazines and newspapers have but one objective, and there is only one side to every question. Then the radio carries the faith into millions of homes, while the clubs, institutions and factories keep the Communist doctrines ever before the workers through speeches, posters and pamphlets. Even the theatres and the movies, the opera and ballet are impressed into the service of beatifying Communism."

Soviet Russia to-day is a great land for celebrations, parades and general jubilations. It is all

part of the grand plan of advertising and of stimulating interest, enthusiasm and optimism. Any attainment of some phase of the Five-Year Plan that is deemed pivotal and important, or that happens to come at a time when good news is scarce and interest seems to be waning or lagging, is seized upon by the Soviet authorities as an excuse to stage some public demonstration. A great street parade, celebrating an epoch-making economic victory or a wonderful, claimed achievement, is followed by fervid speeches, much self-congratulation and the singing of revolutionary songs, including the Internationale. The Roman mob demanded bread and circuses—food and entertainment; the Russian masses are kept entertained by Soviet circuses of the grand-parade-and-general-jubilation type, but for bread—black, at that—they do not fare as well as the old Romans; they have to stand in line for their rations, doled out by the State, and this only in return for their labor.

The Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party acknowledged the importance in the Five-Year Plan of "the development of national cultures among the people," and said, "At the basis of the program of cultural construction must be placed those tasks of public education which will insure the cultural growth of the wide masses of workers and peasants." What is meant by "culture" and "education" is primarily, and almost solely, knowledge of and conformity to the tenets of Communism. The people of Russia must be able to read, in order that the exclusively-controlled press may broadcast the messages and thoughts of authority to the masses instead of to a restricted percentage of

them; the "cultural" phases invariably associated with education are neither of importance nor of interest to the Communist. It is said that three years after the revolution 63 per cent. of the Russian population were illiterate, but this percentage, due to the Communist "culture" campaign, is being rapidly reduced. It will, and it should; but education in Russia is essentially of a political and an economic nature, and the ability of the people to read is demanded, in order to fill them with ballyhoo about Communism and to stimulate and goad the workers to high productivity.

Education of children in the Soviet Union is primarily communist training. The three R's are considered subordinate to communist ideology and practical principles. The prime idea is to make young communists, not to develop the human mind. Reading is important so that the residents of the Soviet Union—both young and old—can read the propaganda fed to them and "hear their master's voice." Moscow tells us that the Soviet campaign on education is working under the slogan "No illiteracy by 1934"; yet 30 per cent. of Russian children are not attending school to-day and the other 70 per cent. are overcrowded, many schools operating with two and three shifts. The first qualification for a school-teacher is that teacher's proper and approved mental attitude toward Communism; this is infinitely more important than academic training, capability, or natural talent in teaching. The second is mental honesty, coupled with fervor for Communism—and bigotry, it is decreed, will make a still better teacher of the young and impressionable. The third is a firm and unwavering

anti-religious attitude. A full-fledged atheist is considered most desirable, and a scoffer, or one who ridicules and burlesques old religious beliefs, will carry favor with the authorities.

The Communist State is a jealous state. It demands that it maintain a monopoly on education, social-welfare work, literary and recreational training; it will not permit any institution of any nature or kind whatsoever to exist, in the realm, that may win minds and hearts away from the teachings of Marx and Lenin—as interpreted by Stalin.

Before the war, the proportion of illiteracy among army recruits was: Germans, 1/20th of 1 per cent.; British, 1 per cent.; French, 4 per cent.; Russians, 62 per cent. It may not be generally known, but the illiteracy record of the United States is nothing to brag about, being far worse than that of the leading European countries. The Census Bureau announces that 4,283,178 persons in the United States above ten years of age cannot read or write in any language; this represents some three and a half per cent. of the total population, whereas in Germany the percentage of illiterates over six years of age is stated at only three-hundredths of one per cent. It is estimated to-day that about 60 per cent. of the inhabitants of Russia from sixteen to thirty-five years of age are literate; that about one-third of those between thirty-five and fifty years, and about one-quarter of those over fifty years of age can read and write. Schools are lacking, teachers are very poorly paid (\$26.50 per month in the children's schools), and scholastic standards are very low.

Not only are the schools in Russia used to make

Communists out of the children by means of steadily-presented authoritative propaganda, but a hostile and vicious propaganda is maintained which deliberately misrepresents foreign peoples and cultivates some fear, and much bitterness and hatred, of all such foreigners in young Russian minds.

In Russia, as John Dewey says, "Propaganda is education, and education is propaganda." Lenin wrote, "The school, apart from politics, is a lie, a hypocrisy. Bourgeois society indulged in this lie, covering up the fact that it was using the schools as a means of domination by declaring that the school was politically neutral and in the service of all. We must declare openly what is concealed, namely, the political function of the school."

In "A B C of Communism" Bukharin says, "The true basis and meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat must be a proletarian monopoly of education. This may appear shocking, but the monopoly of education always was, and always is, the most important privilege of every ruling class. . . . The monopoly of education must become the privilege of the proletariat if the proletariat is to win," and, again, "Communist propaganda has become a necessity for the whole society now undergoing regeneration. . . . It is therefore necessary that not merely the proletarian school, but, in addition, the whole mechanism of the proletarian state should contribute to the work of Communist propaganda. This propaganda must be carried on in the army; it must be carried on in all branches and by all instruments of the Soviet power."

Theoretically, education is compulsory in the Soviet Union. Illiterate adults are urged and are

being almost compelled to learn to read (writing is not so important); and all children are supposed to attend primary or elementary schools—if the schools are built and the teachers available. The middle and advanced stages of learning are deemed to be almost exclusively the prerogative of the born proletariat; the façades of colleges, such as the Moscow University, have had the significant words chiseled thereon—"For the Toilers." In 1928 it is said that out of 20,865 students admitted to universities in Russia proper 68.1 per cent. were the children of workers, or "toilers"; 19.1 per cent., of "employees," or "white collar" trade-union labor; and only 11.3 per cent., of the so-called intelligentsia, with some 1.5 per cent. unclassified. The Russian school is the world's greatest attempt to force minds, with their opinions and fully-developed prejudices, into one standard mold, shaped and dimensioned by Communism, and that of the peculiar and distinctive Russian brand. Education in Soviet Russia is a one-way channel—confined in both intake and outgo; with all other entrances for ideas and exits for thoughts barricaded. The policy of indoctrination, with the regimentation of opinion and the restriction of individual freedom of thought, is being carried to the n th power, far beyond all the cumulative and aggregate attempts in the past by either temporal or so-called spiritual "divine right" dictators to dominate a people.

The Five-Year Plan proposes to increase the number of moving and talking picture theatres and stations from 8,500 (1928) to 34,700, and it is said that in two to three years "the picture houses of the Union will be entertaining (instructing) over one

billion six hundred million visitors per annum." Lenin said, "Of all the arts, I believe that the cinema is the most important," and he, moreover, declared that "the radio is the unwritten newspaper of the masses and the most effective way of reaching the illiterate." When the Five-Year Plan was launched there was one radio receiving-set in use in the Soviet Union for each 400 of population; the Plan calls for the number of radios to be increased eighteenfold, giving one receiving-set, on an average, to every 22 persons, and it is said that "the number of persons listening to the radio will grow from two million in 1927-28 to more than forty million in 1932-33." In pre-war Russia, we are informed that less than a hundred million books left the press per annum. In 1927 the number had increased to two hundred and twenty million, and it is expected that in 1932-33, 619,000,000 books will be printed and circulated—all carefully censored and guaranteed to be innocuous matter, with most of them sheer propaganda. The circulation of newspapers is to increase 3.15 times and magazines 3 times, with mail facilities increased so that "the word" of (the Communist) god "will reach every hamlet and every home."

Art in Russia is being encouraged and developed, primarily because of its propaganda value in the interest of Communism. Not only are the silver screen and "talkie" capitalized as servants of the dictator, but music, poetry, the drama, literature, painting and sculpture are all not only tolerated, but encouraged and subsidized by the Communists as mediums of expression of the Revolution and as potent instruments of authoritative propaganda.

Music is being urged upon the people, but the songs advocated are generally communist and proletarian—solidarity and revolutionary—themes. The Soviet national hymn is most significantly the “Internationale”; it is more than the “Marseillaise”—the national song of republican France,—more than the “God Save the King” of the British, and infinitely more than “The Star-Spangled Banner” or “My Country ’tis of Thee” of the Americans. It is played or sung with reverence at every large gathering or celebration in the Soviet Union. Communism is an international, not a national, system. Communism seeks to moderate and abolish all the antipathies between different races and nations, but it definitely encourages and aggravates what is a hundredfold more destructive and deadly—a conflict between classes, with the low and the common seeking to annihilate, not only the so-called upper classes, but the bourgeoisie and the solid middle classes, who are the real substance and hope of the world.

Every possible phase, channel, or means of publicity is being used in Russia to-day to obtain enthusiastic support for Communism and its Five-Year Plan. The printed and the spoken word, generally permeated with figures, is being used to mold a people’s beliefs, eliminate their criticism, bolster up their hope and increase their output. Mature men and women are being taught to read, not for their own happiness, but because the authorities decree that the official propaganda must be effective, and much of it will be lost if the people for whom it is written cannot read it.

“American intellectuals,” it has been well said,

"appear before the world in rôles that are naïve rather than liberal in their attitude toward Sovietism; European intelligentsia are not so unsophisticated," although European industrialists seem to run American capitalists a close second in the love of money and an American rapacious appetency to grab the dollar of to-day—notwithstanding the catastrophic reaction that is inevitably associated with its acquisition. Europeans generally sense and discount all "news" and statements that come out of Russia, and their best minds "find nothing intellectually stimulating," or honest, about Sovietism. The American is, however, pathetically gullible, as well as inexperienced in world affairs (political, economic and social), and in a desire to be fair he is emotionally influenced in judgment and leans over backward. The American intellectuals are shallow in diagnosis and in resultant knowledge, and not only "take kindly" to, but "fall hard" with avidity for superficialities and spellbinding mirages offered to them as realities; moreover, they have what is virtually a mania for anything new and "radical," and their bigoted and emotional reaction to novelty they erroneously define as liberalism.

It is impossible to subscribe to a set of beliefs in Russia and "stay put." The right to-day is both left and wrong to-morrow. The Communist Party, however, which stands ready at all times to modify and even drastically change its policies of the moment (when they are under pressure and some change in either plan or tempo seems necessary or desirable), never at any time has even considered changing its aims and its ultimate goal. Lenin encouraged private trading and later hounded the

Nepmen that he had created. The Kulaks are urged to work, prosper and make money, and soon after are ordered to be "liquidated" or exterminated. When Stalin was fighting Trotzky and his following, the Communists who desired to "play safe" followed the orthodox or "safety first" line of belittling the Kulak danger and of favoring a "policy of conciliation" toward him; two years later they had to jump quick from the extreme left to the extreme right when Stalin branded the Kulaki as a primary danger, with instinctive and unchangeable anti-revolutionary characteristics. No wonder the slow-thinking and slow-moving proletarian Communists are distressed at times and cry out, "How do we know what to think? One day Bukharin is exactly right; another day we are told that he is all wrong."

Stalin is a more ruthless, but less brainy, switcher than Lenin, who, on one occasion, called Stalin "crude and narrow." He will, however, "team up" with any force and with any enemy, and seek to conceal his guile with soft words; but, after all, Stalin is crude, and his gains and the attainment of his objectives are more a reflection on the gullibility and low mental or discerning power of his contacts (generally foreign) than they are an index of his cleverness. One of the most amazing aspects of the present Russian situation is that apparently sensible, balanced, and more or less mature and experienced democratic (and so-called capitalistic) peoples not only are, but can possibly be, so thoroughly doltish, slow-witted and short-sighted as they have proved, and are proving, themselves to

be. No wonder we are told that "avarice blinds and stupefies the capitalist."

Stalin will shake hands with his foes or drive them forth to obscurity and death; his attitude at the moment depends entirely upon existing conditions and what is at stake. No man has a greater hatred or more all-permeating feeling of vindictive revenge for the so-called bourgeoisie, the capitalists and one-time ruling classes than Stalin; yet he well hides his bitter feelings under an armored veneer. An individual may be a saint, a self-sacrificing philanthropist, a St. Francis, but if he was born "bourgeois," that is enough; he, with his entire class, must stand the full force of the Communist dictator's cruel hatred and retaliatory revenge, as Joseph Vissarionovich Djhugashvilli recalls being beaten up by the Imperial Czar's Salyan Regiment of drunken soldiers at Vologda during the Easter holidays of 1909 and the humiliation and abuse that he was constantly subjected to, as "a man of the people," when the old order of weak Czar and Czarina, superstition, unscrupulous priests, decadent aristocrats, and either inhuman or indifferent plutocrats ruled over and oppressed a people where freedom and democracy were unknown. Stalin was exiled to Siberia six times by the Czarist Government, and five times he escaped; he was finally deported in 1913 and remained in exile until the Revolution. Under Stalin's own government he might have been exiled once, but never twice, and he never would have been deported; he would have been shot. Stalin has been described by Sherwood Eddy in "The Challenge of Russia" (1931) as "a mountaineer peasant, a somewhat ruthless Georgian Asi-

atic," sagacious, honest, with rugged courage, indomitable will, titanic energy and force, who "pushes irresistibly forward like a giant tractor or steam-roller in the great process of communization," and "when too many are crushed by the great machine and the outcry of those who suffer becomes too great, he puts on the brakes, or even backs up a little, only to drive forward again" in the irresistible process of striving to reach the objective, which embraces not only the Russian proletarian, but the whole world.

Much capital is made by the Communists of their policy or system of *Sama Kritika* or "self-criticism," but the less they say about it, the better—for their cause. At the time of the twelfth anniversary of the Revolution, the Communist Party included among its slogans: "Through Bolshevik self-criticism we will enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat." The Plan was devilishly inspired by the Party and their protective advisers, the G. P. U., to find out not only about the relativity and seriousness of "sore points," but to definitely locate the natural faultfinders and originators of trouble, the "forecastle lawyers," the individualistic and original thinkers, and the embryonic agitators. It was also stated that it would create and tremendously develop a competitive spirit among the workers, and it was further affirmed by the knowing secret police that most of the "self-criticism" expressed would be definitely aimed, not at "self," but at "the other fellow." It was always decreed, however, that the privilege of criticism did not extend to Party principles or to the policy, plans, or orders of the dictator and his administrative board; and it was further

stipulated that any critic must at all times give unhesitating and complete assent to the tenets of the Communist faith. "Self-criticism"—quite subtly and without creating any splash or surface agitation—has caused many arrests and many disappearances for claimed "counter-revolutionary" ideology. It has openly created and stimulated rivalries which the Party feel are to the interest of the cause. It has also operated as a safety-valve that pops under G. P. U. supervision and has removed much of the possibility of a growing and festering inarticulate combativeness and opposition, which, if secretly organized and nurtured under cover, might develop to proportions that would cause the Party much trouble.

Rykov tells of a manager of an industrial operation who, complaining of the presence of nine separate control commissions and inspection committees at his works—with their endless demand for statistics, studies and considerations or recommendations, which naturally divert management from its proper function,—declared, "My time is wasted in a most unproductive manner on reports, conferences, negotiations, etc. When am I to find time to work?" This little bit of constructive criticism, looking toward the good of the Party and its grandiose industrialization plan, resulted in the most earnest and loyal man being "attended to" by the much-feared G. P. U. The management and heads of departments of any operation in the Soviet Union are apt to be accused of "counter-revolutionary" sentiments and removed, dismissed and punished if the output is falling materially below the quota set and the "self-criticism" of the workers takes the usual

form of criticizing the bosses. Again, many industrial leaders have fallen into the hands of the dreaded secret police because the quota that they advocated proved to be lower than what was possible of realization; such pessimistic estimates are considered as expressing "counter-revolutionary" sentiments and an unsympathetic feeling to the Five-Year Plan.

Stalin, with Lenin before him, and all the leaders of the Communist Party, the Soviet Government and the International are positively Machiavellian in cunning and unscrupulousness. It is their nature to deceive and to take advantage of the gullibility of others. Most communist methods of getting and keeping power, of overcoming resistance and winning support are defensible (if at all) on grounds of practical expediency, but positively not on those of moral idealism. Ethics, honor and truth are simply non-existent in the make-up of the German-Jewish-Russian brand of Communism.

To go forward with their plans, Stalin changes, and will change at any time, any settled Communist policy to a temporary one of expediency that, under apparent liberalism, will operate to attain the results desired. The world is led to believe, by means of authoritative propaganda from Moscow, that the Communist Party, with its dictator, have had a change of heart, have "scrapped" their old beliefs, or have decided to capitalize, for the benefit of the Russian social experiment, certain tenets, fundamentals, or phases of capitalism. Nothing could be more false and further from the truth. The Soviets are willing to either "liquidate" or to pamper (for a short time) any class, profession, or group in Russia. From the human standpoint they

are indifferent whether their decree is "thumbs up" or "thumbs down"; they are fundamentally interested in only one thing: Is their decision for the ultimate good of the revolution? To achieve results, to get work done, to enjoy and benefit by the creative ability of genius and of trained technical minds, the skill of specialists and the constructive work of experts (both executive and indirect production); to acquire the knowledge and the means of doing needed things and of getting them done, when, how, and as wanted, the Soviet Communists would make a pact with any or all devils, would sign anything on any sheet of paper, would make any sort of promise, would hob-and-nob with any capitalist, and would pose as broad-gauged modernists or, even for the moment, as "repentant, oft-erring Magdalenes." (A term often used in Russia with reference to Communist leaders, who talk left and then switch to the right, or talk right and then switch to the left—because it is policy to do so.)

When Lenin, in May, 1917, was scheming and planning to get the reins of government of Russia into his own hands—during the time that the Social Democratic Provisional Government (with Kerensky) at least "assumed" that they were in power—it is amazing to read what this later revolutionary Bolshevik Communist had to say about government. He maintained that the Constitution of the democratic Republic of Russia must insure (1) the sovereignty of the people, (2) universal, equal and direct suffrage, (3) elections with secret ballots to express the people's will, (4) inviolability of person and dwelling, (5) unlimited and unrestricted freedom of speech, press, religion, move-

ment, occupation and assembly; of forming unions and of declaring strikes, etc. This is a democratic and capitalistic ideal; it is what we have, at least in theory, in the United States; but the Communist form of government, as developed by Lenin and Trotzky, is in every respect and in every detail the antithesis and the exact opposite, and that to the extreme, of the Lenin formula, dated two months after the overthrow of the Czar. Most assuredly Lenin was a turncoat, a switcher, and an opportunist of an astounding mental and moral obliquity and elasticity. However, to a Communist "the end justifies the means," even if the end is hell, and the means a mere assumption of humanity and of fictitious heavenly sainthood.

Sherwood Eddy says that one of the most notable characteristics of the leadership of Russian Communism has been "its continuous change and its quick and constant adaptation to the circumstances of a rapidly altering environment. Probably no government in the world in the last dozen years has made so many colossal experiments . . . none has been so quick to adapt itself to changing conditions."

When Stalin becomes more liberal with old Russian engineers and repudiated members of the intelligentsia—for years ostracized, "deprived" and declassed, imprisoned or exiled,—he does so simply because they have something that he wants, has to have, and is determined to get. Stalin's attitude to the men who are to be tolerated and "recognized," to their beliefs, principles and ideals and to their class does not change at all; he still hates and despises them and, vindictively, would like to

harm and punish them still more, but finds he needs them and must use them. Such men are tools to be used and, when worn out, thrown on the junk-heap; they are vessels containing germs of potent, economic life, to be drained and then smashed. This is an illustration of the working of the materialistic theory of life as expounded by the Communists. Opportunism is conscienceless, but its all-enveloping and all-permeating deceit hides its crude wickedness at times—particularly to emotional and superficial propaganda-fed Americans who worship the written word and believe all that they hear and all that they read in print.

If the Communist dictator is impressed with the fact that the people of the United States generally feel very antagonistic in regard to certain Communist policies, and if Stalin desires to attain a certain objective here, we may expect to receive cabled dispatches intended to counteract American criticism and allay American apprehensions. Communist propaganda of the Russian brand lends itself better to falsehood and deception than to truth and fact. Moscow, moreover, is very solicitous to impress Americans, as well as being accommodating and anxious to correct any reactions that may prove harmful to Russia, so if there is a sufficient amount of American criticism of any phase of Russian Communism (demonstrated in its practical operation), the most pleasing, as well as the easiest thing, for the Soviet propagandists to do is to give American press correspondents some false and corrective "shots of dope," which are invariably received with joy and broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the nation, without any regard whatso-

ever to truth or even to reason. There are some people in the United States who, at times, actually go so far as to preposterously attribute to the Russian Communists, feelings of regret and sorrow for the "immoral and inhuman" mistakes that they have made. Gullible people should not read the modern and "inspired" fairy-stories of Soviet Russia if they have any tendency to take them seriously or consider them other than either Machiavellian and devilishly "inspired" or time-killing fiction for grown-up children.

The Constitution of the All-Union Communist Party reads, "The Central Committee (of 71 members and 50 candidates) organizes for political work a polit-bureau (9 members); for general administrative or organization work, an org-bureau (12 members), and for the current work of organization and execution, a secretariat (5 members)." Stalin, as Secretary General, is a member of each committee, with a small and select group of interlocking directors. Lenin, in 1921, said, "All questions of domestic and foreign policy are settled by the Polit-bureau." Stalin is the unquestioned dictator. He is the Chief of the Party and is looked upon and acknowledged as the Chief and Dictator of the Party, of the Soviet Government, and of the International by every Party member and Communist in Russia and throughout the world. His power is enormous. He can reward or penalize, promote or demote any Party member or any official; he is supreme.

The Communist Party in Russia, to survive, must be a unit with one mind, hence must be under the domination of a small group which, in turn, must

follow the leadership of one man—the dictator. If the Party should become divided and split, such as for a while seemed possible in the Stalin-Trotsky controversies, the outcome would inevitably be the end of the Communist Party as the despotic governing force in the Soviet Union. However, Stalin has maintained the solidarity of the Party during a period of great internal differences, has weaned many of its most powerful and influential members from Trotsky influence, has not only weakened but discredited Trotsky in Russia, and all is now calm on the surface and seemingly harmonious within. The Communists know that they have to stand together as one unit and function as one undivided mind. They can have no conflicting differences and can tolerate no disintegrating politics within the Party, for any weakening in the power and in the exercise of that despotic power—fortified by terrorism—means arrest, imprisonment and the firing-squad for the Party members if a democratic, a more socialistic, or any other party element rose to governing power by rebellion and sought to tranquilize the country with the support of a substantial part of the people.

Sherwood Eddy speaks of “the efficient, but dangerous centralization of power in the hands of a small group rigorously excluding or crushing any deviation to the left or right of their policies and program,” which group operates to control “the Communist Party and, through it, both the government of Soviet Russia and the Comintern or Third International”; the latter controls Communist (individual and group) activities throughout the world and is a movement of “unique solidarity and uni-

formity." Rykov said (Nov., 1926), "Our system of economic administration even to-day is still centralized, to a degree, based on mistrust of every minor link of the chain." Rykov, the brilliant Soviet Prime Minister, was dismissed by Stalin in December, 1930—the distrust is not only shown to "minor links," but to prime leaders of outstanding ability. Trotsky was banished and Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, etc., humiliated and disciplined. Certain demoted Communists are retained on seemingly important committees, but, as they do not enjoy Stalin's entire confidence, they are not found in his ruling Cabinet of all Communism—both domestic and foreign—the Political Bureau.

We are told that Trotsky stood for international revolution, Stalin for the perfect development of the revolution in Russia and peace with all other peoples; that Stalin's policy won out and Trotsky was banished, and, therefore, Russia has renounced her originally-decreed Communist plan of working for international revolution—all of which is absolutely false. Stalin had the sense to know that Russia was in no condition, politically and economically, to wage war with any foreign power; that Russia was dependent upon capitalistic states for armaments and munitions of war; that Russia was woefully backward industrially and could not live if trade with foreign nations were cut off; that the ownership of land meant more to the peasants (subjugated by force) than any other thing, and the Russian peasant would welcome war and an invasion if, through them, he could actually achieve real ownership of land; that Russia could never become independent and self-supporting without the help

of the most progressive of capitalistic countries. It was because of these facts that the Five-Year Plan was conceived and inaugurated.

Lenin, notwithstanding his lack of sympathy for any form of nationalism, knew that a class revolution, originating in and expanding world-wide from Russia, must have something to offer the proletariat of foreign lands that was better than they already enjoyed. He declared that "Russia must cease to be poor and helpless, and become, in the full sense of the words, powerful and plentiful," and, again, "Russia must, as quickly as possible, catch up with and overtake the technical and industrial achievements of the leading capitalistic countries."

Lenin's New Economic Policy (Nep), inaugurated in 1921, which was a temporary compromise between State and private capitalism, came at a time of famine, with epidemics rampant and the Soviet Government at the point of collapse. The "Nep" resulted in a period of relatively peaceful economic rehabilitation and the slow and painful partial restoration of wrecked or severely-damaged industry and agriculture. Lenin said, "We can only continue to exist by making an appeal to the peasants." In August, 1921, he referred to "our present ruin," and affirmed that it would take ten years for the proletariat to "supervise and guide" the small farmers from individualistic to socialized labor, and he urged that, as State capitalism was "a step forward toward the destruction of the small bourgeois attitude," means be found "of directing the evolution of capitalism in the bed of State capitalism so as to insure the transition of State capitalism into Socialism."

Lenin's promulgation of "Nep" was a typical communist opportunist switch; he never for one moment intended to encourage private trading beyond the point where it would help Communism to "find its legs and get its bearings." The Five-Year Plan, or some other generally similar scheme, became necessary, however, around 1926 if the country were to remain communist, he stopped in its downward gravitation and stimulated out of its lethargy toward a measure of productivity that would make it at least as strong a power as it was under Czarism in pre-war days. The war scare with Britain in 1927 convinced Stalin, and his inner circle of aides, that Russia, to survive as a communist state, and as the Banner Carrier of the International—with a chain of unfriendly capitalistic states on her Western frontier,—had to be an independent and self-supporting military, as well as industrial and agricultural, state. The breaking off of diplomatic relations with Britain, with unfriendly and threatening, or at least disturbing, rumblings from Poland, was a factor of tremendous import in causing those investigations to be made and certain economic estimates and plans developed that resulted in the ambitious and impressive Five-Year Plan being launched in October, 1928.

Lenin is generally regarded in Russia as the advocate of Communistic systematic planning for the future and the father of the present Five-Year Plan. Soviet economists, as well as Communist Party leaders, contend that capitalistic society, with its private enterprise, is fundamentally anarchistic in character and, therefore, incapable of developing comprehensive plans which, in a truly collectivistic

and universal spirit, embrace simultaneously all sections and all phases of a country, a continent, or of the world as a whole. At the Eighth Congress of Soviets in 1920 Lenin said, "When great plans appear, whose calculations embrace many years, skeptics will frequently arise, who say: 'How are we to estimate ahead for so many years? Let God do what is needful to do.' Comrades, we must know how to unite this and that; we cannot work without a plan which covers a prolonged period of time and which is directed toward genuine progress. Do not fear plans which are outlined for long series of years ahead, because without them you will never construct a regenerated economy. Let us rather press on toward their fulfilment."

The Five-Year Plan is simply a concrete expression of the basic economic and political program of the Communist Party—to industrialize Russia and make of her a complete world nucleus of "pure" communism, self-supporting in foodstuffs and all needed manufactured products, well organized for peace or war with respect to the ample production of industrial and agricultural products, armaments and munitions, and well protected with the largest, best-equipped, best-disciplined and (due to propaganda) the most fervid and best-prepared (psychologically) army in the entire world.

Lenin had no faith in the ballot or in "soft" socialism, and he despised tepid liberalism and pacifism. "Not even the bourgeoisie," we are told, "aroused Lenin's wrath more robustly than the pacifist, or brought down on himself a more furious castigation." The Communist is a fighter and a soldier—disciplined to fight in an army and blindly

obey orders, and he shares his old leader's contempt for a pacifist, or a "soft" socialist "that talks and dreams of brotherhood, equality and justice, or of the ballot and that bourgeois sentiment—liberty."

Zinovieff, the Communist leader of Leningrad (once head of the Third International), said, "The chief aim of our epoch is to suppress the socialist parties, which are now the most active weapons of the bourgeoisie." The Russian Communist "furiously despises" the Socialists, "Social Democrats, and Labor Party leaders of Western Europe." Following in Lenin's footsteps, they brand the leaders of these parties as Judas Iscariots—not worthy Socialist crusaders—and blame them and their "two-spot patriotism and nationalism" for repudiating, denying and betraying "class" and proletarian solidarity and for even permitting the beginning of, and the mobilization of troops for, the infamous World War. Socialists who talk of the ballot and of gradual victory through co-operation and compromise with capitalism are denounced with vitriolic contempt; such leaders "are scamps or lickspittles, or both." No matter how honest certain members of the intelligentsia may be, if they do not fully conform to, and support whole-heartedly, the Marx-Lenin-Stalin brand of Communism, with its formula of human reconstruction and prescribed mode of social behavior, they are branded scoundrels and wreckers, poltroons and traitors, and are consigned to "the garbage heap of history." The conflict between labor and capital, between communism and democracy (with its majority rule, its individual human liberty and its capitalism) is to the death. All that stands in the way of communism must be

ruthlessly destroyed. It is hardness that distinguishes the Russian Communist from all other radicals and revolutionists in the world. In the words of Turgenev, the Russian Communist in revolutionary times must have "audacity and malice . . . these are more pressing than food, and as vital as air."

Of all who worked and sacrificed to make the Revolution and overthrow despotic Czarism, the intelligentsia did the most and the best; they suffered the most and obtained the least. They laid the foundation and worked faithfully to make their dream come true, but these old Russian radical and liberal intelligentsia, who, of all things, desired human justice, human liberty and the development of human individuality, were overridden by the bloody and inhuman proletarian-Bolsheviks, and in the moment of triumph of the "Red" revolution, which in reality was the brutal usurpation of power by an unscrupulous and bloodthirsty section of the lowest class (with the subjugation of some ninety-nine per cent. of the people by a well-organized and frenzied handful of street fighters, drunk with power and easy victory), they, the teachers, the builders, the inspirers and the guides to revolution, were not only discarded, but savagely thrust aside and then forced into the background, the deeps and the shadows—disillusioned and disowned, deprived and disfranchised, outlawed and exiled, or put to a quicker violent death. The intelligentsia of Russia enslaved, forced to obey a churlish, despotic master or die! We read on a Moscow public building, "Revolution is a storm sweeping aside everything that stands in its path." The old intelligentsia of Russia (the very name *intelligentsia* was coined in

Russia) were swept aside by a revolutionary storm that they themselves had helped to create; and men who suffered imprisonment, persecution, or exile under the Czar, because of their revolutionary principles, are not only repudiated by the Communists of to-day, but are despised, tormented, and condemned to a living death—if unfortunate enough to escape a quicker and more pleasant death by the gallows or shooting.

Eve Garrette Grady hits the nail on the head when she says that "Russia's method of wiping the human slate clean, of establishing society on an equal basis, of making her 'interesting human experiment' a world laboratory for those who have eyes but do not see, is by actually killing off every class of society that is not communist, worker, or peasant"; she could have omitted the word "peasant" and qualified the word "worker." Peasants are tolerated in Russia if they are poor, weak, and easily dominated—for the proletariat need food. A "worker," in Russian parlance, is a manual urban laborer—not a rural or agricultural worker, and not an office man, a "white collar," or an educated man.

There are reported to be many Five-Year Plans in Russia; one is to overcome all illiteracy; another is to make the Union godless and churchless; another is to give everybody who works, enough to eat, and still another is to exterminate all the "deprived," aristocratic and bourgeois classes, including the Nepmen, Kulaks and Intelligentsia.

The Communists delight in staging and featuring dramatic trials, where the accused are of the intelligentsia and conditions seem to warrant making a theatrical example of a few important men in

order to intimidate and terrify others. The Shakhta trial in 1928, which ended in the execution of six engineers of the Russian intelligentsia for claimed sabotage, is one specific illustration. The most outrageous trial of this general type, however, for silver-screen, ridiculous sensationalism, planned by immature dramatists, staged and presented by crude amateur actors, and fortified by every mechanical and soulless accessory known to science, was the comparatively recent trial of eight highly-placed and well-educated technicians of the despised intelligentsia. The Soviet press in October, 1930, featured the report of the arrest of these men, accused of participating in an international plot of the most amazing and ridiculous character, which, according to the allegation—most seriously made and ludicrously elaborated upon,—involved not only Russian émigrés of monarchistic leaning, resident as exiles in Western Europe, but also many leading statesmen of France, Britain, Poland, Roumania, and other countries which aimed at the overthrow of the Soviet Government by military means. Although no death sentences were actually carried out (so far as the outside world has been informed), this court spectacle, with moving-picture cameras at work and with certain parts broadcast by radio to all parts of Russia, was the greatest theatrical gesture offered at the shrine of the great god Ballyhoo in the history of "civilization." As a dramatic act, it is unfortunate that it was so badly done that, notwithstanding human life being supposedly at stake, the audience outside Russia were convulsed with laughter at the crudity of the performance, when they should have been in tears. Capitalistic Hollywood, in one of its

worst, crudest and cheapest moods, would have done the thing infinitely better than the world's greatest developer of bigoted propaganda.

There is only one way, one plan, one thought at any time in Russia; and that is the way, plan, or thought decreed by the dictator. To-day the arrow points one way, and to-morrow another, but a good Communist must function as automatically and brainlessly as a mechanical weather-vane, moved to any of the four points of the compass, or to any intermediate point thereof; he must be always receptive and compliant, move without resistance or friction, and "conform." He who would be a real "man" and a non-conformist to such external dictation has no place in Russia except in a grave, dungeon, or even a torture chamber—for even these diabolical "playthings" of the Cheka and G. P. U. still exist and are kept in use. The Russian dictatorship also operates to make a Communist the most bigoted and lopsided man on earth. He is blind, deaf, and his brain is deadened to non-communist "truth" vibrations or impressions. A Communist becomes saturated with the authoritative-decreed buncombe of communist "principles" and with a stimulated and goaded passion until, as Hindus says, "he is as open to the persuasion of an opposing social creed as an old-fashioned Calvinist is to the teachings of Buddha." Communism is never wrong. The Communist dictator can never make a mistake. He may switch or tack, advance or retreat, but he is always right. The Communists are Marx's chosen people—perfect, inerrant, infallible!

It is not very long ago that, before a crowd of some one hundred thousand people in the Red

Square, Moscow, consisting principally of workers and soldiers, Bukharin, the impassioned orator and official spokesman of Communist thought and policy, on behalf of the "Trinity of Death," i.e., the Soviet Government, the Communist Party and the Third International (three entities with one leader dominating them singly and collectively; three manifestations of the same god or devil), exclaimed, "We Communists announce to all our enemies that never for a minute, never for a second, never for one-millionth of a second will our Party retrench from these proposals, which it has inscribed on its banner, that mighty slogan, that mighty watchword of militant Communism—International Social Revolution,—which will battle until it has freed and organized the world's proletarians. Long live the cause that is destined to conquer the whole world." Maurice Hindus says, "The Russian Communist has not the least notion of pocketing his revolutionist ardor. He is a veritable flame of revolutionary enthusiasm. World revolution is one of the big sustaining forces in his life. It is the very soul of his revolutionary passion. . . . It is to him at once a great hope and a great inspiration, a great weapon and a great aim. . . . The revolution is higher than Russia, higher than any nation, any movement. . . . He regards the Russian revolution as the lighthouse of proletarian sovereignty in the tempestuous sea of capitalistic domination. . . . He views it as the mightiest immediate weapon at his command with which to inflame the mass of humanity to revolutionary ardor. . . . He is determined to defend the revolution against all encroachments, internal and ex-

ternal, . . . if necessary, with terror, constant and ruthless."

In its Constitution, adopted in Moscow in 1919, the International is described as "a union of Communist parties of all countries into one proletarian party, which fights for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the creation of a world union of Socialist Soviet Republics, for the complete destruction of classes and the achievement of Socialism—that first stage of Communist society." Congresses of the Communist International, held during recent years, have fully reasserted these basic objectives, have stated their avowed goal as the overthrow of the existing political, economic and social order in every country in the world, and have simultaneously prepared a detailed program of revolutionary strategy and tactics, which is nothing but universalization of the Russian revolution and a plan to apply (with minor variations) the methods and tactics of the Russian Bolshevik revolution to other nations.

The Third International, in strong distinction to its predecessor, has laid down as a fundamental rule the observance of strict discipline and the complete subordination of the individual parties, which comprise the International, to the decisions of the Executive Committee in Moscow. In one important resolution we read: "All class war is political struggle. The object of this struggle, which unavoidably turns into civil war, is the conquest of political power. . . . To lead the working class successfully in the approaching, long and stubborn civil war, the Communist Party itself must create iron military order within its own ranks." The same Congress of

the International made it obligatory for all Communists "to create illegal apparatus, even in countries where they are permitted to function legally, and to carry on illegal agitation among the soldiers and sailors."

In addition to Moscow being the executive and control center of the International, it is also its educational center. A training school for agitators and propagandists is maintained in Moscow, which is attended by students from foreign communist parties who, when they return to their native countries, are thoroughly grounded in the principles of Marx, Lenin and Stalin. George Seldes says that thousands of foreigners are being instructed at the Swerdloff University in Moscow "to assume leadership in the coming wars." Britain should be interested in this school, for it is said that "two hundred men a year go from it over the Khyber Pass into India," and it is said that it is this influence that caused Gandhi to declare himself an anti-capitalist and in sympathy with many of the "ideals" of Communism, although they could not get him to change his natural Indian policy of passive resistance for that of violent military revolution.

Communists in Russia, and throughout the world, regard the Russian revolution as the introduction to the world revolution. One of the first signs greeting a traveler at Nyegoreloe, the Soviet border station on the Polish frontier, reads, "Long live the World October (International) Revolution, which will turn the whole world into a union of Socialist Soviet Republics."

The Communist International is a product of the Russian revolution and a world-wide extension of

Russian Communism. It is known as the "Third," inasmuch as the World War broke up the Second International, for the Socialists in the various belligerent countries placed nationalism ahead of internationalism. The opinions and policy of the All-Union Communist Party, which is the instrument of an absolute dictatorship in Russia, are also in practice at all times; the opinions and policies of the International and all foreign Communist parties are dependent on Russia for everything, "from subsidies and a political asylum to the ideological excuse for their own existence." Whatever the Russian Communists do is approved promptly and unreservedly by the International; whatever the International says or does, or whatever the Soviet Government says or does, is at the dictation of the All-Union (Russian) Communist Party, which Stalin, the despot, controls. The statements emanating from Moscow, from time to time, stating that the Soviet Government and the International are entirely separate and distinct and have no connecting link, are mere items of false, defensive propaganda, directly intended to bamboozle and beguile the ignorant, trusting Americans.

The Communist Party, the Soviet Government and the Third International—the great "Red" Revolutionary Trinity—the big "Three in one," are one and the same in substance, with the same power permeating all, and the same brains and personalities in control. There is an interlocking directorate, or, what is more important, an interlocking of the power, force and mind behind the names of persons who function as directors. A Russian Communist can argue that the Soviet Government

and the International are entirely different, and that the Soviet Government is not responsible for what Communists of the International may do. This may be technically true, at times, as far as "the letter" is concerned, but never according to "the spirit," the absolute reality, or the true facts.

A prominent American banker, returning from Russia recently, said (*Christian Science Monitor*): "The same men who control the government of Russia are behind the subversive propaganda in this country. Whether you wish to quibble over the question of whether the propaganda is carried on by the Russian Government or by an agency set up outside of the government makes no difference. When the same men who are engaged in directing the propaganda go from the 'government office' to their 'propaganda office' they do not cease to be government officials," and, he adds, "It is the first time in history that one country has carried on an extensive trade relation with another and has at the same time tried to undermine and overthrow the government of the country it is trading with. Sooner or later the question must come to a head. We cannot go on indefinitely trading on a larger and larger scale with a country which is intent upon setting up another government in our own country."

Zinovieff, at the Twelfth Party Congress, minimized the importance of the Soviet Government and declared that the real dictatorship was that of the Party, while the Soviet Government was but a "fifth wheel." He said, "The Central Committee of the Party is, in fact, not only the Central Committee of the Party, but also of the Soviets, of the

trade unions, of the co-operatives, and of the entire workers' class. Therein lies its principal rôle; therein the dictatorship of the Party is expressed." At the Fifteenth Party Congress in 1927, Stalin, not liking the term "fifth wheel," spoke of the Communist Party as "the helm of the Government." The Communist Party, with Stalin at the helm, truly steers the Russian Ship of State and the International, i.e., all Communists in every part of the world.

The Inner Group of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party, composed of nine members (with eight alternatives, or reserves), meet frequently, their decisions "are binding for the Party," and it is officially admitted that they "largely determine the policies of the Government, the Trade-Union movement and the Third International." Sherwood Eddy says that it may help to visualize the situation if we "draw a triangle, with the Political Bureau and the Communist Party at the apex, one line of influence extending to the Soviet Government and the other to the Third International; the Political Bureau is the Super-General Staff, with full power."

Stalin said, "No important political or organizational problem is ever decided by our Soviets and other mass organizations without direction from the Party. In this sense we may say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is substantially the dictatorship of its vanguard; the dictatorship of the Party is the force which directs the proletariat," and, again, he affirms that to all responsible positions in the Government, the Communist Party (the only party that has a legal or any other form of exis-

tence in Russia) nominates its candidates and sees that they are elected. "Naturally these men follow out the theories of Communism, in which they believe, and follow explicitly the direction of the Party; therefore, a direct Communist leadership results. . . . Here in Russia the Communist Party openly admits that it does guide and give general direction to the Government."

Stalin and his inner cabinet—the despotic power of Communism—know at all times what the Soviet Government is doing as regards policy, and they know equally well what the International is doing and is going to do. What is more, they outline or dictate the policy, and are responsible for every phase of it and for every change made in it. Soviet lies about the International, Soviet chicanery, Soviet sophistry, Soviet double-dealing, and Soviet hedging remind one of children playing politics—yet many Americans with trustful souls "fall" for Russian explanations, and become satisfied that the blackest evil is as white and pure as driven snow, when it is merely whitewashed by a flood of words that are essentially false and mere ballyhoo.

When a Soviet Communist says, "The Russian Government has not the least intention of obtaining control of other countries," the statement of itself (attributed to Chickerin) is probably true, but it is the usual sort of Communist half-truth. As George Seldes well points out, "the seven or nine men who are the Soviet Government, and who have 'not the least intention of obtaining control of other countries,' meet again as the seven or nine men in control of the Russian Communist Party, or the seven or nine men in control of the Third Interna-

tional, and at these meetings all the intentions and all the work are aimed at one thing, the Russian Communist control of other countries." Sherwood Eddy says, "There is no denial that the Russian Communist Party largely influences and, at times, almost directs both the Soviet Government and the Communist International. There is no question whatever that the policy of the Third International is one of world revolution. It has been, it is, and it will continue to be such, with or without recognition."

In their public statements we read that the aim of the International is the establishment of a communist society and the victory of Communism in all lands; to end the domination of capitalism, wipe out State boundaries and transform the whole world into one Communist Union. Sherwood Eddy says, "Through this remarkable triumvirate of the Communist Party, the Soviet Government (as the first Communist State) and the Third International, the dictatorship of the organized proletariat proposes to extend its sway in widening circles from an inner, all-powerful, dominating group to the final anticipated régime of a World Communist Society," and with reference to the power that controls Communism being focused "in a very small group" he says, "There are nine full members in the inner, all-powerful political bureau, dominant among whom is Stalin, Secretary General of the Communist Party. This Party influences and largely dominates the Soviet Government of Russia, the trade unions and their world organizations, called the Profintern and the Comintern or Third International. The whole plan lends itself to a powerful

and effective centralization"—much more so than Mr. Eddy admits. The Communist Party, the Soviet Government and the International are like the Christian Trinity—three apparent individual entities in one Godhead, but one Supreme Being; one all-highest, overruling and dominant power.

Russia has tried to make trouble abroad, and she is doing it persistently and with steady pressure through the Third International, but Russia has been bitterly disappointed in her efforts for extending Soviet domination contiguous or reasonably close to her in Europe and in China, India, Persia, etc. She knows to-day that either she has not the power or other lands are not ready "to buy the type of communism which she offers to sell"; the sample submitted does not appeal to the prospective buyer, and many forms of sales resistance are in evidence.

The last written statement by Lenin contains some significant words—"The proletarian masses in India and China are becoming enlightened enough to wage the struggle side by side with Russia. When that happens, world revolution will be successful." Lenin had no doubt that Russia would be the subjective element in these revolutions widening the Russian to world-wide revolution, and it appears that he felt that the masses of certain countries had to be "enlightened enough" to bring the proper objective element into play. Since when have any revolutionary proletarians been "enlightened"?

The three countries where revolution is looked for most hopefully by the Russian Communists are Germany, China and Poland. The sore spots for near-time future troubles to develop when Russia

is ready are: Roumania (for the Soviet Union has never waived claim to Bessarabia, occupied by Roumania in 1918, and this province is marked as Soviet territory on all maps printed in Russia); Poland; the Baltic States; China, with respect to Mongolia, and Japan (in the Far Eastern territory), in regard to Manchuria. India has its own peculiar nationalistic movement, and, in India, Communists excite and cause much trouble and discord, but find it impossible to control; Persia and Afghanistan are kept somewhat turbulent by Communist agents, and Turkey is definitely friendly to the Soviets. Czechoslovakia and Germany have the largest admittedly enrolled Communist parties in Western Europe.

Russia is the one great country of the world that, like the United States, is capable, geographically, climatically, and with due regard to size and population (actual and possible), of being absolutely independent—when developed—of the rest of the world. Russia could grow to be independent and self-sufficient in both an economic and a military sense. The Soviet Union occupies about one-sixth of the land surface of the globe; it is almost three times as large as the continental United States and has four times the area of the continent of Europe, excluding European Russia. It has been said that "an American living east of Cleveland, Ohio, is nearer to Moscow than many of the Eastern inhabitants of the Soviet Union." The population of Russia, at the end of 1930, is estimated at slightly more than 160,000,000; it was 106,256,000 in 1897, and 147,013,600 in 1926—by official census; the increase in population per annum is stated at 3,660,-

000, whereas the increased population per annum of all the rest of Europe combined, with 2.3 times as many people, is estimated at 3,000,000, or some 18 per cent. less in the aggregate than the Russian increase. The Soviet Union has over 60 per cent. more arable land than the United States, with about the same acreage under cultivation (with India running a close third). It contains all the natural products upon which our modern civilization rests, and its climate is frigid, temperate and torrid, making it possible, it has been said, to raise everything within the realm "from parrots to polar bears; from cotton to icebergs."

Russia, to-day, is not an independent, self-supporting country, so she is not ready to use military power abroad. She is preparing herself, however, to become a strong, armed power, not only by conscripting her young men and training them well, but by the industrialization of the country, which means not only industry for commerce, but industry for the armaments and munitions of war, and industrial methods, merchandise, collectivism and mass production applied to food and to certain crops needed for industrial national independence. Russia knows her present weakness and her insecurity. The Five-Year Plan was designed to overcome her backwardness and to bring her up among the first flight of nations as a self-sustaining and military power.

Russia wants peace to-day, for without it her industrialization plan would be wrecked. Russia can tolerate no condition that would close her frontier, prevent her from buying machinery and expert, or specialized, brains abroad, and keep her from dump-

ing some of her own commodities in foreign countries in order to pay for her purchases; this must be done, as Russia has virtually no gold, no real buying power, no real credit, and, therefore, cannot stand any adverse foreign-trade balance.

Communists have said that two elements are required to make a revolution—such as they desire—possible: (1) The subjective, which must be a party physically strong and prepared, and psychologically equipped to launch the revolution; (2) the objective, which must be a condition of life, or what Lenin called “an imminently revolutionary situation which provides the opportunity for action.” Lenin was opposed to starting a revolution anywhere unless these two elements, the subjective and the objective, existed in a measure deemed sufficient and propitious to give reasonable assurance of success. Russia, according to the Communist, must be the subjective element in any geographical expansion embraced by the revolution. The International is merely an organized grouping of outposts throughout the world; the brain, the power, is in Russia. The revolution commenced in Russia is the world revolution—the International. There will be no new revolution—simply an extension of the present one until it covers the whole world.

Russia is woefully inadequate to-day, as a military power, to function as the subjective element in world revolution; this is due, not to men or spirit, but to armaments and munitions, and to a production and manufacturing shortage within her own boundaries of those commodities needed to feed, house, supply and equip a people, as well as military armies, during a period of war. This is the

only reason why Russia talks peace with all nations to-day. There is no permanent peace between revolutionary communist Russia and any capitalistic, democratic nation. A sort of truce has developed, and, during the armistice, capitalistic nations are competing for the business of building up, equipping and training Russia, their enemy and their would-be destroyer, to be an independent industrial, agricultural and military nation that can, and ultimately not only will, but must, wage war against all democratic and all so-called capitalistic peoples.

"It is possible," writes C. B. Hoover, "that the fanaticism of the Party will entangle the Soviet Union in foreign wars for the purpose of furthering the world revolution. This is bound to happen whenever the Soviet economic system has been placed on a successful and stabilized basis. But it may happen before that time. If it does, the economic development of Soviet Russia would be set back indefinitely. The Party realizes this, and until present difficulties are solved the Soviet Union will make every effort to prevent itself becoming embroiled with any first-class power."

No nation in the world ever needed peace with the outside world more desperately than Russia. She is engaged in a series of Five-Year Plans and is working against time. A pacific policy for the present and for the next few years is imperative for the Soviet Union and for Russian communists. This does not mean that Soviet leaders are becoming soft or human, or have undergone any "change of heart." Communists are brutal, cruel, and avaricious for power and domination, and the Communist doctrine is nothing if not militant. To-day, how-

ever, Russia is virtually helpless—in an economic, industrial and military sense,—as well as an Ishmael among nations; she is too weak and dependent to thrive, support and defend herself, or even live, if the great so-called capitalistic powers should combine and become active against her. Sensing these fundamental conditions of which Russian communists are both fully and painfully cognizant, it is no exaggeration to describe the Soviet foreign policy as one of “Peace at almost any price”—for the present. The future will tell a very different story.

George S. Counts, in “The Soviet Challenge to America” (1931), writing of the uncertain quantities which may greatly influence the outcome of the Soviet economic challenge to the world, after commenting on Russia being still “eighty per cent. rural” and referring to the fact that “a general failure of crops, due to drought or pests, might well prove disastrous,” says, “Equally disastrous would be a foreign war, even a war of the most modest dimensions. It would mean the mobilization, on a fairly large scale, of both man-power and economic resources for non-productive purposes. Since there is no great surplus of goods in the Union to-day, such a mobilization could be achieved only at the expense of definitely sacrificing the program of construction. Certainly the surest possible guarantee of the peaceful intentions of the Soviet Government is the fact that war would mean the literal scrapping of the Five-Year Plan. The Communist leaders, consequently, are entirely in earnest when they show alarm at the appearance of even relatively inconspicuous war clouds above the international

horizon. Until their heavy industries are well established, they will go to any length to keep the peace. Thereafter, of course, it may be a different story."

At the Fifteenth Conference of the Communist Party, held in 1926, the following resolution was passed: "We must strive in the shortest possible historical period to overtake and surpass the most advanced capitalistic countries, and thus insure the victory of Socialism in its historic competition with the system of capitalism." Time is the major factor in the Russian Communist movement that seeks (1) to be firmly established in a territory that comprises one-sixth of the world's land area, and (2) World Revolution, international communist solidarity and world domination by the proletarian communists. Throughout the inner circles of all planning and directing committees in Moscow the prime objective is "to build the trenches of industry before Russia is blockaded by capitalistic countries"; to make Russia self-creating and self-supporting and "absolutely independent of all other countries in the production of armaments, munitions, manufactured goods and agricultural products." The Five-Year Plan is designed to make Russia capable of living and prospering, without regard to other nations, and to make her not only capable of defending herself against any foreign invading force, but powerful enough to wage war against capitalistic countries; fortified to fight, both on the front, with excellently trained and equipped troops—tanks, airplanes, poison gases, etc.,—and in the rear by highly-organized, seditious proletarian-communist propaganda, with its "Workers of the world unite" and "Join forces

with the 'Red' International Army of workers."

The Five-Year Plan is giving prime consideration, throughout the Soviet Union, to the mechanism of propaganda. The radio, the moving- and talking-pictures, the press, the theatre, etc., are all being extended to an amazing and almost unbelievable degree in order to carry the dictator's voice and his satellites' "authoritative" propaganda—with every word and every program fully censored—to every corner of the realm and to every place where the people congregate and the "one or two are gathered together." What is classified as education, amusement and "cultural pursuits" in Russia is sheer, crude propaganda, with all matter that is not communism, politics, or economics decidedly and almost painfully innocuous. It is, moreover, significant that of the "Combinations of Union Importance," now operating full blast and under pressure in Soviet Russia, is one openly designated as "War Industries." The Five-Year Plan is preparing for war as far as both armaments and "the minds of the people" are concerned. Never before in the history of the world has a vast population been so controlled in their thoughts and in their acts.

If the Soviet Union enjoys peace with all the world (which, to-day, she craves), and if foreign capitalistic countries continue to trade with her, as at present, or extend credit to her and increase Russia's foreign purchases, her future seems somewhat assured—provided the propaganda mills in Russia continue to grind and meet with the phenomenal success they have encountered during recent years. The only way to retard or defeat communism in Russia and "international" revolutions in other

lands is for the so-called capitalistic and industrial nations of the world to place an absolute embargo on all goods crossing the Russian border either way.

The Russian proposal made by Litvinov at Geneva for the complete disarmament of nations was an absurd piece of bluff, believed to be subtle and clever by the communists and intended by them to be used as propaganda. As W. H. Chamberlain says, "No one in Moscow expected that these drastic disarmament proposals in the strained European political situation would be accepted or even seriously considered. It was anticipated, however, that a certain amount of sympathy would be forthcoming from Germany, chafing under the state of affairs where she is disarmed, while the victorious powers in the World War remain fully armed, and also from pacific opinion throughout the world.

Rykov, who until quite recently was called the chief Soviet publicist, in the official *Pravda* wrote, "It is our duty to inculcate in the minds of all nations the theories of international friendship, pacifism and disarmament, encouraging resistance to military appropriations and training; at the same time, however, never for one moment relaxing our efforts in the upbuilding of our own military establishment."

George Seldes says that in the barracks of the Russian Army he saw, everywhere, signs reading: "Down with the International Bourgeoisie" and "The Red Army is the instrument of international communism." At a recent Congress of the International, held in Moscow, it was said, "Now that the Russian revolution is safe, the Red Army must be made an International Army, to fight everywhere,

to create more communist revolutions." The new Red Army of Soviet Russia is the first and only military force in the world that is an international army, organized to fight, not for a nation, a king, or feudal lord, but for a class of society—and that in every country of the world. The "Red" Army of Russia is openly referred to by the Third International as "their army," and this with the full concurrence of the interlocking directorate of the Communist trinity and their despotic dictator. The International is admittedly the "General Staff" of World Revolution.

The Russian revolution would not continue to grow without her large conscripted army, and the Soviet army training-plan is far more than teaching the use of weapons and military tactics. The army is intended to make good soldiers, but it is being used to educate the young men of Russia to be fervid Communists and ardent, fanatical fighters for the cause of the proletariat. An army camp in Russia is a school for revolution.

During two years' service in the Red Army, the conscripted youth of the land are compelled to pursue a "propaganda" program of intensive study of revolutionary writings, and the aims and policy of the Soviet Government, the Communist Party, and the International are strongly, as well as subtly, presented in an effective setting. The new Red Army is even selective to the degree that the real fighting corps are made to very largely consist of youth coming from the proletariat and the poorest of the peasantry. Whereas a few years ago only 10 per cent. of the Red Army were Communists, it is said to-day that more than 40 per cent. of the

soldiers, and a majority of the officers, are members, or prospective members (on probation), of either the Communist Party or the Union of Communist Youth. The soldiers of the Red Army are even taught to obey their officers—who are generally proletarian Communists—only so long as the commands given “are in the interest of the proletarians and the working class of the world.” The first essential of Russian Army training is admitted to be “firing the men with revolutionary ardor” and instilling in them the fervor of crusaders and the zeal of missionaries—even to the supreme test of martyrdom. The old Muzhiks brand the new revolutionary spirit that is being instilled into the peasant, as well as the urban proletarian youth, as “that devil’s blood” with which they are inoculated by the State, but the Communists affirm that not only is the “Red” soldier the most dependable soldier in the world, but he is a revolutionary missionary of force, champing at the bit or straining at the leash, not only ready and willing, but most anxious to go.

The Russian Red Army is the product of a governmental military system which demands of its young men two years’ service—if they are able-bodied and wanted. It is a universal and compulsory system with respect to youth; but discretionary and optional as far as the State is concerned. Some of the young men of Russia are accepted and get army training and a communist education for two years; others are put into the militia and serve for eight months with but little chance to make trouble, if they should be so inclined. Many an able-bodied young man, for “political reasons,” is not acceptable to the Red Army; an ancestry (proletarian) is im-

portant if one would go far in the army—fully as much as in a labor union. According to the law of August, 1930, conscripted youth may be sent to factories to work, provided “military instruction is given during such employment.” The youth of the large disfranchised element in the Soviet Union cannot escape conscription, and the sons of traders, priests, kulaks, intelligentsia, old army-officers, landlords, aristocrats, etc., are assigned compulsory work for two years by labor boards, without being given military instruction and without being permitted to bear arms. The army in Russia is training men to be useful in the promulgation of the Five-Year Plan, and during the period of two years’ military training and communist education the Soviet State trains its conscripted soldiers to be farm managers, section managers, etc. In two years (1928-30) about 160,000 young men left the army at the expiration of their two-year period of enforced military service to become “specialists” assigned to work in the villages. The Communist Party find in the army a most excellent school for communism and discipline, and they make the most of it along practical, productive lines.

With some 2,000,000 Communists, 2,500,000 of the League of Communist Youth, 9,000,000 Proletarians and Trade Unionists (both manual and “white collar” of both sexes)—but excluding the before-enumerated communists and communist youth, and some 1,000,000 in the Red Army and G. P. U.,—we total some 14,500,000 organized and privileged members of the Communist body social, who, if they were all loyal, would naturally be supposed to stand up and fight for Communism.

This represents 9 per cent. of the population of the Soviet Union. The peasants and rural element aggregate some 81 per cent., the deprived, declassed and pariahs some 6 or 7 per cent., and the difference can be considered as non-producing members of urban families not included in the League of Communist Youth, the Army, etc. It was reported that only 10 per cent. of the Army in 1925 were Communists, 27 per cent. in 1928, and, in February, 1929, it was said that 18 per cent. were members of the Party, and a further 24 per cent. (42 per cent., all told) were enrolled in the League of Communist Youth; of the officers, 54.2 per cent. are reported as Communists. Of the members of the Communist Party it is said that about 13 per cent. are women, and of the members taken into the Party during the early part of 1930, 84 per cent. were manual workers and only 2.4 per cent. were "white collar" employees.

Reports indicate that 1,200,000 youths become eligible (as of age) for the Soviet army each year, of which number about 800,000 are said to be, on an average, physically fit and otherwise generally acceptable; of these, some 460,000 are definitely conscripted for service, about 260,000 being assigned to the regular army or navy and some 200,000 to territorial or reserve units—which are organized on a regional militia basis. About 340,000 of the young men are partially trained, but not enrolled in definite military units; they are being put to work in factories and elsewhere, without pay, and receive strict discipline, military training and communist, with some academic, schooling. Of the 400,000 exempted or rejected for military duty, some are ex-

cused from such service on account of higher education or because of Communist Party activities; some, because of being physically unfit, and others on account of belonging to classes of society that are considered socially or politically unreliable for military training and the bearing of arms. However, all are under State supervision and domination, and any or all are assigned tasks that it is felt will further the cause of Communism and weaken all counter-revolutionary sentiment.

The regular Red Army, including the small force in the navy, is said to consist of 562,000 officers and men, of which about 15,000 are in the air force. The uniformed gendarmes number about 50,000; the border guards, who patrol the frontier, with its hundreds of miles of barbed-wire entanglements—more formidable than those in use during the World War,—aggregate 70,000; the convoy guards, used principally to escort prisoners to the lumber and other working camps, total some 60,000, and industrial, farm, railway and highway guards, etc., are said to aggregate some 150,000, making a total of 330,000 organized, armed, and fully-militarized guards to assist, in addition to the Red Army and the secret, non-uniformed police of the G. P. U., in making the Soviet Union "safe for Communism." The border guards, to keep Russians from escaping from the proletarian "Utopia," and the convoy guards, used for escorting outlawed men and women—condemned, as convicts, to a slow and dreadful death,—number as many armed men as the entire army of the United States.

The military force of the Soviet Union also includes some 250,000 "irregulars," selected from

the Communist workers, and these are armed, well trained, and supposedly unusually reliable and earnest; in addition, various authorities place the experienced and available army veterans and trained, organized reserves at from four to four and a half million. One recent investigation gives the organized reserves at 4,528,000 and the total uniformed ranks at 5,387,000,—which includes not only the regular army, but certain uniformed and militarized parts of the G. P. U. (Cheka), such as the border, convoy, factory and farm guards, etc. Of the reserves it is said that 575,000 “are now undergoing active military training during certain periods of the year.” It is, moreover, reported that on the books of the Revolutionary Military Council are Trade-Union Rifle Clubs, numbering about four million, who “receive occasional military training in encampments.” A recent survey of the armed forces of the Soviet Union states that there are 1,317,000 men uniformed, trained, organized, armed and ready for war; a “military man-power” of 9,400,000, or some six per cent. of the population, and a total defensive military man-power of 21,000,000, or some 13 per cent. of the population. These figures are for men only, but, in the Soviet Union, women are also being drilled, organized and militarized.

W. H. Chamberlain says, “The spirit of Russian Communism strongly suggests that of a new, young, fanatical, crusading religion, with a set of infallible dogmas in the shape of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, and a rigid hierarchical organization in the Communist Party organization to enforce discipline and doctrinal orthodoxy,” and,

again, "Self-sacrifice and devotion, intolerance of opposition, boundless faith in an end which justifies the use of any and all means for its achievement—which of these typical psychological traits of Soviet Russia could not be matched in the fresh, early stages of many of the creeds which, at various times, have captured the faith and imagination of different sections of mankind?"

Russia naturally would like to see other nations disarm; this would add to her security. Russia would be willing to concede much to remove the foreign menace of weighty capitalistic armaments, but, no matter what she promised, Russia would manufacture armaments and munitions, and train her young men to bear arms and to be rabid proletarian Communists—whether they were called the army, the militia, the communist guard, the Cheka, or something else. Russia is being militarized more and more, day by day, and the present policy will continue, no matter what the Soviet Government may say or agree to. In Marx phraseology, the Stalin-dominated and Communist-controlled Soviet Government, when theatrically making its proposal for complete disarmament of all nations, had "nothing to lose and a world to gain." The communists of Russia are, first of all, concerned in blocking the creation of, or in weakening and seeking to paralyze, any and all military, political and economic movements that may be made or that may be planned to be directed against them by so-called capitalistic nations.

All new conscripts joining the Russian army are put through a certain impressive initiation and are required to swear undying allegiance to the prole-

tarian Communist cause by the "Red Oath." In his solemn declaration, every recruit says, "In the presence of the working class and of the whole world I swear to direct all my thought to that great goal, the liberation of all workers. I swear to battle for the cause of Socialism and the brotherhood of all peoples, to spare neither my efforts nor my life." (The text is abbreviated.) The "Red Army catechism" teaches the conscripted Russian youth that the real and strong bourgeois enemies of the Communists are concentrated "in England, France and America," and that bourgeois nations are fighting, or will fight, the Soviet Union "because they know that the proletariat class and the Red Army will establish a workers' and soldiers' government in their countries instead of the present capitalistic governments that rule them now."

The Red Army, which is not only the military force of the Russian Government, but a peculiarly organized and "educated" communist and international class army of the proletarians, will march to war some day with the banners that they are now being trained under and which read: "Death to the Bourgeoisie"; "Freedom and power to the Proletariat"; "Down with the enemies of the Third International"; "Death to the middle-class governments." The Red Army and its slogan-fed soldiers have had pounded into their heads not such nationalistic sentiments as "Russia for Russians" or "Defense of Home and Country," but "The Red Army is the instrument of the masses for conquering the world." This army is psychologically trained, and "thoroughly fed-up" with an all-permeating and consuming hatred of the middle classes

and of every phase of capitalism or of democracy and majority rule, to fight, not a national, but a class, war; not to defend Russia, but to win the world.

It is well, moreover, to keep in mind that when Russia fights she will wage a relentless and cruel double war; she will fight at the front and also in the rear; she will fight with her military forces at the battle front, well equipped with every devilish form of modern armaments, munitions and poison gases, but she will also fight in and throughout the enemies' ranks, in the supporting forces, and in the factories and farms behind the lines, in the citizen body and among the workers and proletariat or so-called lower classes, among the "intelligentsia," radicals, mentally flighty and half-baked "educated"; among the emotional and gullible; and her weapons in this "fight in the rear," with its "stabbing in the back," will be propaganda of a plausible nature that will appeal to the ignorant and the superficial; in such subtle and devilish, "poisonous thought" munitions of the class war, Russia leads the world, both in the production of crafty, insidious and subtle matter and in its effective, specific and wholesale distribution.

The Germans used a "Big Bertha" attack on Paris, discharging a few long-distance shells, to lower or weaken the morale of Parisians during the war. Zeppelins, dropping a few bombs on England, were used for the same purpose, but all such militaristic attacks reacted to strengthen the Allies' resolve to fight for victory over the Huns. The Russian communist attack behind the lines will be used to awaken doubts and weaken resolves, and

will not be discharged as an occasional shot or attack, but will roll over a people like a tidal wave—and all will get wet, and be conscious of it.

A leaflet prepared by the Communists and generally distributed to soldiers of capitalistic countries, whenever such propaganda is deemed desirable, reads (in the language of the soldiers addressed), "The day will come when you, soldier of a bourgeois army, will find yourself face to face with a 'Red' soldier. Will you shoot him? Will you betray your own interests, the interests of hundreds of millions of working men of the whole world, by shooting against the Red Army? No! Your duty is to come over with your comrades to the side of the Red Army, to take your place in its ranks, to fight side by side with workers and peasants for the free republic of the Soviets. . . . The Red Army . . . will become the International Army of October throughout the world. It is in those ranks that you must march. . . . You will turn your rifle against the bourgeoisie of your country and destroy it in a civil war." It is such propaganda (which caused mutinies in the French fleet on the Black Sea and among all the Allied troops at Archangel—including the Americans) that saved the original "Red" Bolshevik Army when fighting the "Whites," for it ate, like a canker, into the morale of the soldiers and sailors of the "Allies." What Russia has done in her communist infancy she can not only do again, but do it ten thousand times better—for Russia, the proletariat and the communist.

Whereas it is true that Russia looks toward the United States as its pattern, guide and inspiration,

this appreciation and admiration of what America is and has done is limited entirely to the economic realm of industrialization, the creation of mechanism, and mass production. The communists consider America the acme of capitalism and the highest, as well as the best-fortified, eminence that they will ultimately have to take by storm. Soviet propaganda keeps the Russians both excited and disgusted with America, but the official policy is well defined. It requires that the United States be used to the benefit of Russia and of her Five-Year Plan and extensions thereof; being a capitalistic nation, the communists know that America's industrial leaders can be bought, her legislators fooled, and her innocent, gullible "intelligentsia" beguiled, duped, or even unconsciously subsidized—not necessarily for money compensation; there are many other channels, forms of bait and rewards. That the United States is not overlooked by the communists in their plans to cleanse the world and purge it of all capitalism is evident from Trotsky's remarks, made at the last Congress of the Third International that he attended: "The American bourgeoisie are glutted with the blood and gold of Europe. . . . They warmed their hands at the bonfire of European war. When the flame of revolution is lighted, the American bourgeoisie will be consumed."

Some Americans imagine that the Stalin policy of to-day repudiates Trotsky's belligerent words. This is positively untrue. Trotsky expressed the undying policy of all communists—a policy which is the foundation-stone, not only of the International, but of all Communism and of the Soviet

Government. The Soviet State is not Russia—a country or a nation. It is officially named a Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics. The omission of any reference to Russia was not accidental, but deliberate, and is full of significance; it emphasized the equality of peoples within the domain—with no exploitation of colonies or dominions, and it left the door open for the adhesion of other and future Soviet "Republics" when and as they should be organized in other countries of the world.

Stalin, an intensely practical man, differed with the fiery and aggressive Trotzky (who, nevertheless, is of the intelligentsia), not on the policy of communists or the bed-rock of Communism, i.e., the world revolution, but merely with regard to (1) the "time factor," or the question of the opportune time for certain activities to be either inaugurated or further developed, and (2) the immediate need of the Soviet Union becoming somewhat capitalistic in order to build a state, with the aid of capitalism, strong enough, not only to defy at a relatively early date all capitalistic nations in a military and economic sense, but to acquire, nurture and hold within itself the prolific germ of growth, so that it will ultimately be strong, vigorous and not only independent and self-sustaining, but capable of destroying all democratic and capitalistic forms of government in the world and of winning, by force and terror, all nations to proletarian Communism.

Stalin, the opportunist par excellence, the long-headed politician and schemer, the conscienceless beguiler, drove Trotzky out of the Communist Party and out of Russia, simply because he was Trot-

zky and stood in his way; because he was brainy, belligerent and outspoken in the committee rooms, and because he represented a developing form of opposition which threatened the security of the dictator's chair. Stalin is even a bigger champion of International Communism than is Trotzky, but he is also more cunning, more patient, and can be even more drastic and sudden when he does act.

When the American Relief Administration was permitted to enter Russia and save millions of its people from death, it was restricted and restrained, made subject to the most outrageous supervision and censorship and, though a friend of the people, it was considered an enemy of the Communists and the Soviet Government. As Litvinov said, as he imposed limitations to the charity of Americans, "Food is a weapon"—and the United States is a capitalistic country. The Russian people, even though starving, must shout huzzas for proletarian communism, curse capitalism, and "bite the hand that feeds them" in a compassionate spirit of human brotherhood. During two years (1921-23) America fed, at times, as many as eleven to twelve million people a day, maintained some thirty-five thousand relief stations to deal with hunger, and some fifteen thousand hospitals to combat illness, disease and "the plague," and through it all the Relief Administration had to fight the Bolsheviks—the Communist Party and the Soviet Government. The proletarian communists were desirous of being fed—themselves; but they were quite willing to have all who were not true revolutionists and "Reds" starve to death. Moreover, they insisted that the "Party" should have all the credit and glory for the charity

of life-saving, so they incessantly lied to the starving people and depreciated the part that America was playing. A Soviet official, commenting on Gen. Haskell's threat to withdraw the relief from Russia, said, "Let them withdraw. The World War cost sixteen million lives; what if another five or ten million die? Communism will live. There will be no counter-revolution from starving people; the famine-stricken man gives up; he hasn't the guts to revolt. It is the half-starved, the discontented man who grumbles and eventually fights."

The Bolsheviks combated the American charity workers, not only with sneers and insults, but with deliberate non-support, with subtle and vicious opposition, and with sabotage. They even tried to organize the Relief Administration employees, declare a general strike among them and interrupt the work of fighting death; that this would result in a tremendous loss of life meant nothing to the proletarian communists. Let the Muzhiks and the bourgeoisie die; the future would be easier for the revolutionists, and there would be a less number to fear and to kill. Cheka agents rifled the American Relief Administration offices and their mail-bags (considered immune according to the Litvinov-Brown "treaty"). The charge was openly made that "the entire Hoover organization was in Russia for the sole purpose of getting trade and military secrets." The official *Pravda* said, "Why is America charitable? Why is she sending us food? Because the American farmers have so much grain they are burning it up, and, besides, they get trade information out of Russia." The official *Izvestia* accused Americans, engaged in charity, of "plun-

dering" the Russians. George Seldes, in "You Can't Print That," tells of a booklet circulated widely in Russia that listed agencies for famine relief: As friendly, 265,000 children; neutral, 138,000 children; open, political enemies (the American Relief Administration), 5,000,000 persons, and said, "Under cover of charity the bourgeois relief agencies are . . . boring a canal for the exploitation of Russia by world capitalism. Hoover . . . has spread a complete net over Russia."

The incident that finally compelled the American Relief Administration to consider their humanitarian labors ended and leave Russia is typically Russian—as she operates under the dictatorship of the "Red" proletarian communists. At the Riga docks it was found that a large American vessel was disgorging wheat into freight-cars of the Relief Administration, while near by, and simultaneously, a Soviet tramp grain-steamer was being loaded with grain for export. While millions of people were still starving in Russia and while American charity was still sending wheat to relieve the distress and save the lives of the Russian people (some 3,000,000 Russians actually perished in the famine and associated epidemics), the Communist dictatorship and the Soviet Government were selling wheat abroad.

The American Relief Administration collected \$66,300,000 in the United States (given in an admirable spirit of human sympathy and practical—as well as praiseworthy—philanthropy) to relieve the famine conditions in Russia. They shipped 912,121 tons of food into Russia, and, with a staff of two hundred Americans and employing eighty

thousand Russians, they saved some ten million people, men, women and children (Bolsheviks and non-Bolsheviks), from starvation, receiving in return some gratitude from the "under dogs"—when they knew, and were permitted to know, who was feeding them,—but a great measure of scornful enmity, distrust, and even hatred from the Communists and the Soviet authorities and officials in power.

American charity, by feeding many millions of starving Russians, saved the Soviet Government during the worst period of its régime. Unbiased authorities are a unit in declaring that Bolshevism could not, without American charity, have weathered the storm, maintained its power, and come through the crisis, if at all, without being materially weakened.

American gullibility and shallowness of thought are now contributing most substantially once more to save Russia; to put over the Five-Year Plan; to build up Communism in Russia and throughout the world, and to destroy capitalism, individual human liberty and representative democratic governments.

That Communism obtained such an easy hold on Russia is due primarily to the fact that in Czarist Russia there were virtually only two classes—the aristocrats and the plebes. The backbone of any nation is its middle class, a stratum of society that represents an overwhelming percentage of the people of the United States and yet was woefully lacking in imperial Russia. Under Czarism, the nobility and privileged classes represented some 1.5 per cent. of the population; the entire middle

class, or true bourgeoisie—which contained business and professional men, intelligentsia, scholars, teachers, ecclesiastics, small property-owners, kulaks, etc.,—totaled some 8 per cent., and the balance of over 90 per cent. were peasants or muzhiks, proletarians or manual laborers—all more or less in the serf class. Some two hundred thousand landlords lived on most of the peasant class and took but little interest in the development of Russia; many of them were the cultured aristocrats, Russian by birth and income, but cosmopolitan by inclination, who lived in luxury in the capitals of Europe. The old Russia that could expel the great Count Leo Tolstoi and let him die excommunicated, and could tolerate an “autocratic” form of government with a pathetically weak Czar and Czarina under the domination of a Rasputin, doesn’t excite any human sympathy; but, with a real middle class to stand for sanity and balance and for Aristotle’s “golden mean,” the mere handful of Bolsheviks that gained control of the government by revolution could never have come into power and could never have perfected their organization through force and terrorism to the point where, with foreign economic help, it is to-day rapidly approaching impregnability.

Soviet Russia, which needs peace with all foreign peoples to-day if she is to grow strong, independent and dominant, is nevertheless within her own borders a nation at war. The dictator and Communist leaders, as Sherwood Eddy says, “foment and maintain a kind of continued war psychosis which responds to propaganda with the same heroism, sacrifice and devotion as the millions under arms and

in the cities, factories and farms of all the nations of Europe and America responded during the World War, even to the rationing of food and physical privation." Censorship prevails; any person's mail is opened and read; propaganda and authoritatively prepared or endorsed ballyhoo fills one's eyes and ears and seeks to influence the mind; the border or frontier is closed with barbed-wire entanglements—and is heavily guarded to all those Russians who are "so happy" in the Communist Utopia that, like incarcerated convicts, they seek to escape; the relatives of Russians who slipped out of the country, or who, being given permission to leave on some stipulated mission, failed to return, are kept as hostages; all labor is conscripted, as well as the young men of twenty-one years who are forced into military army, militia, and kindred service, and women and children are also being drafted as labor on the "economic" front; feeding is by rationing, and it is ordered that the belts must be taken up a notch or two and the people must sacrifice in order "to win the war"; "drives" are being made for "victory" Five-Year Plan bonds, and every activity, all productivity and all expenditures are regulated by a dictator who, through an amazing organization, the world's greatest propaganda mill, and a despotism coupled with terrorism—never equaled or even approached in the history of the human race,—is making a fight which will "make the world safe for Communism," with a dictatorship of the proletariat—the lowest,—and sound the death-knell of Democracy, which stands for justice, individual liberty, opportunity, and a square deal for all.

If one doubts that hostages are held as prisoners (with restricted liberty and not at the State's expense) in Russia, ask Prof. Dmitri Krynine of Yale, who cabled G. B. Shaw and Nancy Astor—while on a spoon-fed and personally-conducted trip to Russia, equipped with Communist blinders—asking that in the name of humanitarian principles they intercede with the authorities so that his wife would be permitted to leave Russia and join her husband and son here. Did the international vaudeville team of Shaw and Astor succeed in doing anything about the Krynine case? They did not.

Shaw, when talking to the workers at the Elektrozavod plant in Moscow, is reported to have said, "When I return to England I shall exert myself to persuade British workers to do the same as you are doing here." When Shaw actually returned to England, this arch-pseudo-Communist refused to make any comments on his Russian visit to the labor press, but informed, in writing, the *Daily Worker* (said to be the only Communist type of working-class newspaper in Britain), after the gratuitous insolence of over a week's delay, that his contracts with the capitalist press do not allow him to give interviews. Shaw travels and talks in the skin of the British lion, but his "bray" betrays his real nature.

Soviet Russia is feared by Russians abroad, particularly if they have relatives living in Russia. An American corporation recently found it very easy to obtain any number of competent translators of Russian documents, but Russian after Russian refused to go on the witness-stand in a case affecting the Amtorg Trading Corporation (the Soviet

exporting and importing house or branch in the United States—and, incidentally, believed to be the camouflaged executive headquarters and clearing-house of Russian and International Communism in America) merely to affirm in court that they were Russians, fully conversant with the language, and that their translations were correct. And yet Russia, like the wolf in Little Red Riding Hood, is amazed that America, the little innocent child among nations, should doubt her big heart and humanity.

Soviet terrorism carries beyond the Russian border, and all countries that recognize Russia not only officially receive an Ambassador, trade representatives, etc., but "their inevitable little play-fellows," the dreaded G. P. U. Berlin, which has become a sort of solar plexus of Communism in Europe (Moscow being the brains), seems to enjoy entertaining and tolerating the Communists, but both Paris and London have had plenty of occasions to get both disgusted and indignant at how authorized Russian representatives and their unscrupulous sleuths and secret police operate abroad without regard to either law or decency. The kidnaping and probable murder in Paris of General Koutepoff by Soviet Cheka agents (G. P. U.), disguised as royalists, should not be forgotten. Argentina recently, by vigorous action, announced to the world what she thought of Communism, and whom she accused of revolutionary activities, when the police of Buenos Aires raided the headquarters of the Soviet Commercial Organization Amtorg (Yuzhamtorg) and arrested all members of the staff—145 men and 15 women,—seizing all

the documents and papers that were procurable, among which, it is said, were the outlines of a vast world-wide political, "cultural" and commercial offensive.

Sherwood Eddy tells us that in his opinion, and that of more than a score of other Americans who had investigated conditions in Russia, the four greatest evils of Sovietism are: (1) The Dictatorship, with its severe abridgment of liberty, (2) the Policy of World Revolution by violence, (3) the Anti-religious Policy, and (4) the attitude and relationship to other nations, which did not encourage or warrant co-operation, recognition, loans, concessions, or trade. He, moreover, pithily asks a question that is in the minds of all unbiased, unselfish and freethinking Americans: As the avowed Communist objective is world revolution, involving the overthrow of existing governments, including that of the United States, why should we Americans grant the Soviet Communist Government of Russia recognition or loans, or any other co-operation?

If the United States should "co-operate" with the Soviet Union, it would require and mean, in plain language, "trading with the enemy" and "giving them aid and comfort" in the form of machinery, equipment, manufactured products, or raw materials; buying "dumped" goods from them, and "giving them aid and comfort" with gold and credits. Any "co-operation" with or "recognition" of Russia by the United States means giving very important and substantial aid to a government and a political and social militant principle that aggressively and fervidly seeks to destroy, by sub-

terfuge and force, the economic and political system and the religious and moral beliefs under which we live. Communism is pledged to destroy our country and all its institutions—the Government, the Church (in all its ramifications) and the American home.

V.

AMERICA'S ATTITUDE TO SOVIET RUSSIA

Non-Recognition and Embargo

WHEN the American Colonies rebelled against the arbitrary and despotic domination of Britain and successfully fought a war of independence, Russia declined to acknowledge the existence of the young American Republic; and it was not until 1809, thirty-three years after our Declaration of Independence, that Russia, the last of all the world's powers, deigned to officially recognize the United States and receive an American representative at St. Petersburg. During the World War, when the weak but tyrannical government of the Russian Czar, the superstitious Czarina and the drunken brute, Rasputin—that was ironically fighting to “make the world safe for democracy”—was overthrown, the United States was the first to recognize the provisional government of what was hoped would be a new and free democratic Russia and practically express its co-operative spirit with a substantial loan.

At that time, President Wilson said that America's good-will and sympathy were with “the great, generous Russian people . . . fighting for freedom,” and in his famous “Fourteen Points” he advocates for Russia “the independent determination of her own political development,” also saying, “The treatment accorded to Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good-

will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy." The American Ambassador Francis advised the execution of Lenin and Trotzky for treason as paid German agents. He addressed a message to the people of Russia warning them that "a desperate foe is sowing the seeds of dissension in your midst"; he describes the new cabinet, headed by Lenin, as "disgusting," and it was in an American Embassy car that Kerensky (the head of the provisional Social-Democratic Government) fled the country.

In March, 1918, Trotzky, it is said, made "a memorable proposal" to Raymond Robins, head of the American Red Cross Mission in Russia, that the Soviet Government "would defeat the ratification of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty and resume the war against the Central Powers if the United States and the Allies would aid Russia in her struggle against Germany." The Administration in Washington ignored the proposition made and presented to them, and Russia ratified the Brest-Litovsk Treaty.

As early as July, 1918, Lenin handed to Robins, for transmittal to Washington, "an elaborate plan of Russian-American commercial relations." Ambassador Francis persistently advocated intervention against the Soviet Government, which President Wilson ultimately agreed to; some forty-five hundred American troops joined the Allied force at Archangel, and some seven thousand were sent to Eastern Siberia, where Japan landed ten times as many. President Wilson's action was ill-advised and illegal. Professor Sherman says, "It was an ill-con-

sidered act of policy, wholly without justification in law," and, again, "Allied and American intervention in Russia cannot be justified under any accepted principles of international law." This intervention, which was continued for some fifteen months after the Armistice with Germany was signed, was not undertaken for "national defense" and was without any declaration of war. Moreover, the Allied intervention in Siberia was undertaken at the suggestion of the United States. Senator Borah, on September 5, 1918, placed the matter properly before the country when he said, "While we are not at war with Russia, while Congress has not declared war, we are carrying on war with the Russian people. . . . Whatever is done in that country in the way of armed intervention is without constitutional authority," and he added that it was a "plain usurpation of power to maintain troops in Russia at this time."

It would appear that the intervention of foreign peoples in Russian domestic affairs, with armed forces taking Russian lives—many with democratic convictions,—counter-revolutions and wholesale atrocities, from which the entire country suffered, finally united a war-weary people against both foreign invaders and the continuation of civil war; the peasants generally combined with the "Red" proletarians and under the slogan "Bread, Land and Peace" drove out the foreigners and subdued the "Whites." Chickerin, the Bolshevik Foreign Minister, apparently enjoyed "getting back" at President Wilson when he wrote, "Mr. President, the 'acid test' of the relations between the United States and Russia gave quite different results from those that

might have been expected from your message to Congress. But we have reason not to be altogether dissatisfied with even these results, since the outrages of the counter-revolution in the East and North have shown the workers and peasants of Russia the aims of the Russian counter-revolution and of its foreign supporters, thereby creating among the Russian people an iron will to defend their liberty and the conquests of the revolution."

The foreign armed intervention in Russia has given the Soviets just the excuse needed for the building up and maintenance of a tremendous military army. This army, which is the best-fed, best-clothed and best-treated body of men in Russia, holds (with the secret police) the Communist Party and its dictator in power; but the people are told that the army is for national defense, for the defense of Communism, and for the defense of the working man; that Russia is surrounded by armed foes who are becoming increasingly jealous of her, and that intervention by these armed forces of capitalistic powers may be expected at any time. Sherwood Eddy, in "The Challenge of Russia" (1931), says: "There is an evident and wide-spread fear-psychosis among the Russian people" fomented and maintained by the governing body and the centralized group, with its dictator, who dominate in one unit, regulate and control "all the government, industry, trade, finance, collective agriculture, education, radio broadcasting, film production, platform, public press and police—in a word, all means of communication, information, education and propaganda," and again, "Down the streets of Moscow, one sees great, red banners warning workers and

youth to 'be ready' to repel the coming invasion of Russia by capitalistic countries for the overthrow of their sacred revolution and the rights of the worker."

President Hoover, when director of the American Relief Administration, favored the lifting of the blockade against Russia in order to reveal the complete "foolishness" of the Soviet Industrial System to the Russian people, and, as Secretary of Commerce, he said, "Under their economic system, no matter how much they moderate it in name, there can be no real return to production in Russia, and, therefore, Russia will have no considerable commodities to export, and, therefore, no great ability to obtain imports. . . . That requires the abandonment of their present economic system."

President Hoover could not possibly have foreseen at that time what a fanatical, despotic dictatorship could do in Russia by force, slavery and terror; the enforced deprivation of the Russian people in order to obtain money from the sale of commodities—greatly needed by the people, but arbitrarily shipped abroad and "dumped,"—was not considered; the switches in the Communist policy to the Nep and then to State capitalism and the Five-Year Plan could not be anticipated; the building up of a religious frenzy with a highly-developed martyr complex on the part of young Russia by unheard-of intensive propaganda and persistent psychological suggestion, together with a secret police—with their terrorism and inquisitional methods for hunting "heretics,"—had not been considered, even as a vague possibility.

The United States policy, during President

Harding's administration, was one of positive non-recognition of the Soviet Union because of their "policy of confiscation and repudiation." In March, 1921, Litvinov transmitted to President Harding and the Congress of the United States a message from Kalinin, President of the All-Russian Soviet Executive Committee, suggesting a resumption of business relations between Soviet Russia and the United States. The reply of Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, then Secretary of State, was clear and explicit: "It is manifest to this Government that in existing circumstances there is no assurance for the development of trade, as the supplies which Russia might now be able to obtain would be wholly inadequate to meet her needs, and no lasting good can result so long as the present causes of progressive impoverishment continue to operate. It is only in the productivity of Russia that there is any hope for the Russian people, and it is idle to expect resumption of trade until the economic bases of production are securely established. Production is conditioned upon the safety of life, the recognition by firm guarantees of private property, the sanctity of contract, and the rights of free labor. If fundamental changes are contemplated, involving due regard for the protection of persons and property and the establishment of conditions essential to the maintenance of commerce, this Government will be glad to have convincing evidence of the consummation of such changes, and until this evidence is supplied, this Government is unable to perceive that there is any proper basis for considering trade relations."

(In President Coolidge's first message to Con-

gress (Dec. 6, 1923) he said, "We have every desire to see that great people, who are our traditional friends" (this sounds somewhat like "campaign" buncombe, considering that it took Russia thirty-three years, following our Declaration of Independence, to admit that the United States actually existed as a separate and responsible nation), "restored to their position among the nations of the earth. . . . Whenever there appears any disposition to compensate our citizens, who were despoiled, and to recognize debts contracted with our Government, not by the Czar, but by the newly-formed Republic of Russia; whenever the active spirit of enmity to our institutions is abated; whenever there appears works meet for repentance, our country ought to be the first to go to the economic and moral rescue of Russia." Why the United States should feel under any obligation to go to the "economic and moral" rescue of any country on earth—other than itself—is not known; and to talk to "Red" Bolsheviks of "repentance" and "rescue," not to mention "moral rescue," is amusing and futile as well as essentially "preachy." It would be interesting to know what conditions or interests "inspired" this rather obscure, but "baited-line" message.

Chickerin, the Soviet Foreign Commissar, most probably, as expected, promptly seized what seemed to him a line of hope, and cabled: "After reading your Message to Congress, the Soviet Government, sincerely anxious to establish at last firm friendship with the people and Government of the United States, informs you of its complete readiness to discuss with your Government all problems mentioned in your message, these negotiations being

based on the principle of mutual non-intervention in internal affairs. The Soviet Government will continue whole-heartedly to adhere to this principle, expecting the same attitude from the American Government. As to the question of claims mentioned in your message, the Soviet Government is fully prepared to negotiate, with a view toward its satisfactory settlement, on the assumption that the principle of reciprocity will be recognized all around."

The reply of Secretary Hughes was decisive and timely: "There would seem to be at this time no reason for negotiations. The American Government, as the President said in his Message to Congress, is not proposing to barter away its principles. If the Soviet authorities are ready to restore the confiscated property of American citizens or make effective compensation, they can do so. If the Soviet authorities are ready to repeal their decree repudiating Russia's obligations to this country and appropriately recognize them, they can do so. It requires no conferences or negotiations to accomplish these results, which can and should be achieved at Moscow as evidence of good faith. The American Government has not incurred liabilities to Russia or repudiated obligations. Most serious is the continued propaganda to overthrow the institutions of this country. This Government can enter into no negotiations until these efforts directed from Moscow are abandoned."

It is to be hoped that the present administration will continue Mr. Hughes's direct and definite, uncompromising policy of non-recognition in the interest of the United States and the American people.

Russia's pre-war and war debts total over six billion dollars. France holds some 80 per cent. and Britain 14 per cent. of the Russian pre-war debt, with Britain some 70 per cent., France 19 per cent. and the United States about 7 per cent. of the war debt. According to Moulton, Russia's war debt to Britain is some two and three-quarter billion dollars, to France three-quarters of a billion dollars, and to the United States somewhat less than three hundred million dollars, to which should be added about four hundred million dollars more to cover debts privately held in the United States and the confiscation and destruction of property of American citizens and American corporations.

Jefferson declared that it was the American policy "to acknowledge any government to be rightful which is formed by the will of the nation substantially declared." Advocates of the recognition of Russia acknowledge that the Communist Party, which absolutely dominates Russia, has a membership of only two million or less in a country that has a population of one hundred and sixty million and is increasing at the rate of two and one-third per cent. per annum; that the communists and proletarian workers, collectively, with all who are said to favor the Soviet Government, do not aggregate ten per cent. of the people. How can any government controlled by one despot, supported by $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of the population, and said to be favorable to possibly 10 per cent. of the inhabitants—an estimate which is not accepted, as it would be far too high if freedom prevailed—be considered as "rightful" and "formed by the will of the nation"? How can an enslaved people, deprived of both voice

and ballot, and governed by force, fear and terrorism, express their will?

The argument advanced that the United States has recognized despots, dictatorships and slave states and dealt with "Red" revolutionists in the past and, therefore, should do so again, is weak and unworthy. To affirm that we should recognize a government simply because it has proved itself to be "stable," ignores the moral as well as the national protective phase. To recognize the Russian Soviet Government, said to be "the most stable government in Europe to-day," is to recognize the Comintern, or Third International, and to render aid to the Communists who, as the "Red" Trinity (the Communist Party, the Russian Soviet Government and the International), seek by all possible means to overthrow our Government and our American institutions. The Communists of Russia, through (1) their party (the only one in the Soviet Union), (2) The Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics, and (3) the Third International, have declared war upon all democratic peoples and so-called capitalistic nations, including the United States of America. This fact the United States must recognize, and deal with Russian communists accordingly.

"Organized labor, in the shape of the American Federation of Labor, is violently hostile to the recognition of the Soviet Union," writes William Henry Chamberlain in "Soviet Russia—A Living Record and a History" (1930), "and business and banking firms which are interested in Russian trade have as yet apparently been neither powerful nor insistent enough to exert any appreciable influence in changing the State Department's policy of wait-

ing until there is something like complete capitulation to the American viewpoint on the moot questions of recognition of pre-war debts, compensation for nationalized property and cessation of communist propaganda," and then follows this choice bit, "It is believed in Moscow that as the possibilities of Russia as a market and a field for the application of American industrial technique are appreciated, America's public opinion will tend to forget about the Communist International," etc. In this connection it is well for America to remember Lenin's prophetic words, "The capitalists will sell us the spades with which to bury them." The pressure that will be brought to bear upon our Chief Executive, administration and legislators in Washington will come from essentially selfish and short-sighted industrialists and bankers, and from ignorant and gullible intelligentsia, some of whom are deemed fully competent to teach economics and kindred subjects in our universities, even though they are incapable of making a success or even a living as practical operators in a competitive business world.

George Seldes, in "Can These Things Be," says that the popular opinion during recent years among newspaper men, experienced in foreign affairs, is that "whenever American big business, the steel, oil, farm machinery and international loan interests need expansion in Russia, enough pressure will be brought upon the American Government to lead to recognition and forgiveness." A conservative English editor expressed it pithily: "The United States will also shake hands with murder." But Mr. Seldes reports an interview he had with Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes of the Supreme Court when

Mr. Hughes was Secretary of State during the Coolidge administration. During the conversation it developed that Russia, with its large population "which needs everything that is manufactured, from clothes to tractors," would be a good market for any industrial nation, provided Russia had, or could get, the money to buy; and American business seemingly might profit by recognition of Russia by the United States Government. Mr. Hughes admitted, we are told, that American business was bringing pressure to bear on Congress for recognition of the Soviets, but in response to Mr. Seldes's direct question, "Would the United States recognize Russia for reasons of expediency for dollars, for reasons of real-politik?" Mr. Hughes replied with emphasis, "No; there are also moral reasons in American politics." This is fine; it is also to be hoped that the great protective and patriotic reasons—both material and spiritual—are sufficiently discernible to be recognized and potent enough to demand firm defensive and decisive actions.

"Non-recognition," we are told by Sherwood Eddy, "inevitably carries the implication of latent hostility. Russia keenly feels this." Since when has Russia considered the feelings of any country, people, class, profession, trade, occupation, family, man, woman, or child? Moreover, the United States is grossly at fault if its hostility to the Russian Communists (and to all that the Soviet Government and the International stand for) is allowed to be "latent." Our hostility should be evident, definite, and positive. We should wage an aggressive, economic war against the Soviet Union so long as that country is controlled by usurpers of governing

power and enslavers of a vast people. It is further said that recognition of Russia would inspire "increased confidence" and the "contracts and credit that would follow would very materially affect America's trade with Russia." If the United States became sufficiently gullible to definitely express any confidence in the Russian Soviets, it would live to deeply and sorrowfully regret it. Contracts, or dipping into the Russian proletarian feed-trough, are exactly what the United States as a people would not want and would not stand for, if facts and conditions were clearly known. Credit extended to Russia could be expected to pyramid until it became a very sizable amount and until Russia had developed to the point of showing her teeth, chanting the "Internationale," and throwing her indebtedness to the United States into the vast sea of repudiation where already rests some seven hundred million dollars of debts that Russia owes America and Americans—to say nothing of several billions of dollars that she owes other peoples.

Eve Garrette Grady, in "Seeing Red" (1931), says: "There is an ulterior motive behind any Soviet Government pronouncement, as those who are wise in the ways of Bolsheviks have had frequent occasion to learn. . . . Any one who has paid close attention to the words that Stalin has been uttering for the past year or so, and who continues to say that the United States should recognize Soviet Russia because Russia is about to modify its government to a refined form of capitalism, or because Russia has given up the idea of world revolution and the militant overthrow of every capitalistic form of government, is simply playing the rôle of the

ostrich with his head in the sand. . . . Stalin is willing, nay, glad, to make a speech to his people at any time informing them that they must all work harder and sweat more blood for the Five-Year Plan and world revolution, and when Stalin says 'world revolution' he means world revolution."

It should be kept constantly in mind that Stalin and his hand-picked cabinet of the Soviet Union, the dictatorship of the so-called Communist Party, and the Chiefs of the Third International are one and the same. This follows the program and policy outlined by Lenin, who said, "Unless the Communist Movement captures other countries, its whole meaning is lost and Russia is a failure." In Lenin's Collected Works we read, "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist interminably, side by side, with imperialistic states. Ultimately, one or the other must conquer. Pending this development a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states must inevitably occur." The Bolshevik Revolution, according to Lenin, must not be considered as Russian only, but as international in its scope and significance, and final victory can only be an international victory, with a world revolution and the death or subjugation of not only all monarchies and other forms of dictatorship, but of all republics, of all democracies, and of all rival or different brands of Socialism and Communism—this is the Messianic hope of Russian Communists, and Lenin is their prophet. "The Social revolution," said Lenin, "is coming in America as well as in Europe, systematically, step by step, stubbornly and with gnashing

of teeth in both camps. It will be long-protracted, cruel and sanguinary."

So-called Socialistic Conventions held in various parts of the United States have called upon our national Government to recognize the Bolshevik Communist Government of Russia. To Lenin, who boastfully said, "This power (proletarian communism) that will crush Germany is the power that in the end will crush England and the United States," a Pennsylvania "Socialist" Convention cabled: "Your achievement is our inspiration."

In "The State and Revolution," by Lenin, we read, "The struggle of the proletariat is not merely a struggle against the capitalist class to control the State, but a struggle against the State. The essence of a proletarian revolution is the destruction of the organized State by the proletariat. Until the entire State organization is destroyed, the struggle will not end. That is its aim."

In May, 1928, W. Z. Foster, the Communist candidate for President of the United States, made an "acceptance speech" in which he said, "Our Party . . . creates no illusions among the workers that they can vote their way to emancipation. . . . The working class must shatter the capitalist state. . . . When a communist heads the Government in the United States . . . that Government will not be a capitalistic Government, but a Soviet Government, and behind this Government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat"; and, in February, 1931, Stalin, the Soviet despot and Communist international dictator, addressing the so-called workers—the proletarian communist revolutionists, with their dominated Russian Trade

Unions and associated international organizations and affiliations,—said, "Let us support foreign workers against the capitalists. Let us fan the flames of world revolution. If we succeed, we will overturn the whole world, freeing the entire working class."

"Soviet foreign trade, just as is true of every other branch of the Soviet economy," writes Calvin B. Hoover in "The Economic Life of Soviet Russia" (1931), "is basically an instrument for constructing Socialism in the Soviet Union and also for hastening the day when the World Revolution will have overthrown capitalism throughout the world. On account of this, Soviet foreign trade policy has a very distinct political aspect. To a considerable extent Soviet trade is used as a power in the diplomatic struggle. When the question of the recognition of Soviet Russia by some other country is in prospect, or whenever the question of the resumption of diplomatic relations has to be considered, the possibilities of large importations from the country in question are always dangled before the eyes of the diplomatic representatives. At a time when the world-struggle for markets has become so sharp, and when an increase of millions of dollars' worth of orders for goods would reduce unemployment by thousands, this device is very effective." It should, however, be kept constantly in mind that Russian purchases abroad depend on Russian sales abroad, or on the establishment of credit—and the American business man—ignoring for the moment the broader moral and patriotic phases—is not only a very short-sighted opportunist, but needs a keeper, if, after Russia's record of debt repudiation and

cancellation, with confiscation of all foreigners' property within its domain or that it could get its hands on, and after the Soviet Government's handling of its finances and the cheating and fooling of its own people, he would sell and ship any goods to Russia except for cash. C. B. Hoover also says that the Soviet Union is extremely anxious for long-term credits with foreign industrial nations, and almost unlimited orders can be obtained on this basis, but, he pithily adds, "The capitalists who do business with the Soviet Union might well remember that to the Party, which is more than the Government in Russia, they are as truly enemies of society as the Russian bourgeois, and that if conditions were favorable they would be treated as ruthlessly."

Russian sales to the United States would be not only primarily, but essentially, "dumping" sales, outside of such commodities as caviar and furs. The United States does not need, and cannot absorb, the general products from Russian factories, farms, forests and mines without detrimentally affecting the American market, American prices and profits, and, what is of primary importance, American labor—employment and wages—all of which means American well-being and prosperity.

Any orders that Russia places with America to further her Five-Year Plan operate to strengthen Russia and weaken the United States; build up Communism and crucify human liberty; advance the international and world revolution, and overthrow all democracy and capitalism.

Any goods from Russian factories, farms, forests and mines that are shipped into the United States

are "dumped," and will not only demoralize American business, take money from American pockets and tax receipts from our Government (needed for its operation), but, what is of greater importance, take bread out of the mouths of American labor. The export of American machinery and equipment and of all goods that are desired, and seek to be purchased, by Russia, and the import of all Russian-made goods and products that can be made, produced, or obtained in the United States, should be prohibited, with no exception, by law. An absolute embargo on all such goods, incoming and outgoing, is needed to protect the United States, its people, its Government, its well-being and prosperity, its institutions, its homes, its culture, its religion and its ideals.

It is well known and admitted by the Russian Communist dictatorship that the Soviet Union does not hesitate to produce goods and sell them abroad at less than the cost of production; that the Soviet Union is more interested in making sales and obtaining a volume of business, when they have goods to offer, than in the price realized; that actual sales are of first importance and price of secondary moment; that for every dollar's worth of machinery or supplies purchased abroad, the Soviet Union is determined to force the sale of a dollar's worth of Russian commodities abroad in order to effect a real foreign-trade balance between imports and exports, —thereby requiring no movement of gold until Russia's exports exceed the imports, when gold will flow toward Russia. If Russia obtains credit abroad, she will increase her purchases accordingly and endeavor to complete her Five-Year Plans earlier than

scheduled; but, without regard to credits, Russia must make sales of her products abroad and show a trade balance "pleasing" to her at the moment and "favorable" to her at the earliest practical date.

It is significant that over a decade ago, Lenin, speaking at the Fourth Congress of the Communist International (Nov. 13, 1920), said that Soviet Russia had done a little better than break even during the year and that they had gained or "were ahead" some \$20,000,000 in gold. "A mere trifle," he remarked, "but in any case this sum is available and we will use it in order to raise our heavy industry." Eight years before the Five-Year Plan was launched, Lenin explained to the Communists of the world the Russian trade policy of (1) Domestic Sacrifice, (2) Foreign Dumping, and (3) Purchases of Machinery abroad with the gold obtained from the sales of Russian goods—all in order that Russia "be developed as an independent and strong, military, industrial and agricultural power."

George Seldes says, "Accused of 'dumping' and wastage, the Russians reply that they are not wasting money, because money really doesn't exist, the present currency being temporary, nominal, a compromise. As Soviet officials figure that everything they get in Russia costs practically nothing, everything they sell abroad is practically profit. They do not consider the great economic waste; material waste; waste of time; waste of men."

The most absurd statements are made by members of the American intelligentsia in regard to trading with the Russians. It is not, as they imply, "the quantity" of goods that is "dumped" in the United States that alone upsets the market, but the

price, not only at which the goods are actually sold, but at which they are generally or nationally "offered" for sale. Goods which only represent—to a college professor or a humanitarian sociologist—a ridiculously small percentage of our national consumption can be, and are invidiously, used in the domestic market, by offerings broadcast and goods "spotted" over the length and breadth of the country, to depress prices to the point—in a buyer's market such as now exists—where no domestic producer can get back, as Net Sales Realization, the gross cost of his goods, i.e., manufacturing cost plus distribution expense. Throughout the United States to-day, we hear of low prices that are being "patriotically offered" to consumers during "the present period of depression" and that are said to be offered "in an attempt to improve conditions"; actually, they make conditions far worse. Very low prices, with associated profitless merchandising, must inevitably result in losses to the producer, and such losses naturally reduce or eliminate dividends, lessen Government revenue and, therefore, increase taxes and tax rates, lower wages, lessen national buying power and reduce prosperity. It should be as much a crime to sell any commodity too low as too high. The United States most wrongly deifies unconscionable and unprincipled competition, looks askance and with unveiled suspicion at legitimate and distinctly ethical co-operation, and, as a result, is subjected to periods of depression which could be avoided if business had a chance to operate under a moral and social co-operative system for the good of labor, capital, the consumer, and the country and its people in general.

A movement for a general embargo to put an absolute stop to the entry into the United States of all Soviet-exported goods of every kind and nature, made or handled by Russians or by others within the territory of the Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics, has been started by the American Federation of Labor, with, it is said, the support of the free and non-communist organized labor generally throughout the world. Russia is not only seeking the overthrow of democracy, capitalism and American institutions, but she is doing it with "forced" labor. The Soviet Union is a "Red" menace to free and self-respecting labor the world over.

In an address broadcast by radio, James W. Gerard (our pre-war Ambassador to Germany) covered certain existing conditions and Russia's relations to the United States quite effectively, and outlined possible defensive actions,—admirable as far as they went. "Russia is waging war," he said, "on the rest of the world. She does not merely admit it; she boasts about it. Carrying on under the most despotic state capitalism the world has ever known, she throws down the gauntlet to what she calls the capitalist countries of the Eastern and Western hemispheres. If the other nations of the world are to preserve their institutions, if they are to maintain their standards of existence, their rights to private property and freedom of labor; if they are to press back the spectre of sour black bread and cabbage soup, they must meet the challenge of Soviet Russia. There is only one solution to the immediate problem, and that is for America to set an example to the world by barring Russian imports from coming into this country. The Soviet

government exerts the power of absolute and arbitrary embargo on anything from the outside world passing the Russian border. There is nothing in international law or international procedure to prevent the United States and other countries doing the same to Russian goods reaching their borders. If the United States were to establish an embargo on Soviet products, other nations of the world would probably join in the movement. We should turn back upon Russia the wealth that she is squandering abroad. Let her use her own products to relieve the distress of her own starving citizens, instead of employing them to upset the farmer, the employer and the working man in America and elsewhere."

The United States and all capitalistic and democratic peoples, by definite governmental action, should stop all exports—particularly of machinery and of factory, agriculture, mine and logging equipment, etc.,—into Russia, and stop the definite and needed technical and executive help that they are now giving her to make the Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics a strong and independent communist nation, and a tremendous economic, political and military menace to the whole civilized world.

The Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, by what was virtually a unanimous vote, recently adopted the following resolution: "That the importation of commodities produced within the boundaries of the Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics is detrimental to the public interest and should be discontinued; that it deplors the exportation of industrial equipment and the extension of technical advice to the rulers of Russia, which is, in effect, giving aid to elements seeking to destroy the

economic and political systems under which we live, and is, therefore, wholly unjustified on political, economic, social and moral grounds." Any exports that, with such good reasons, are "deplored" should not be tolerated, but courageously denounced in no uncertain language and, being "detrimental to the public interest" (which is of far greater importance than one or two selfish private interests), they should be discontinued.

The supplying of Russia with machinery for the industrialization of the Soviet Union is furnishing her with the sinews of war and equipping her so that she can become a great and independent nation or union, in a military as well as industrial, agricultural and economic sense, and wage war when and as she is ready "to make the world safe for Communism."

A record, prepared by the Joint Conference on the Russian Situation, Inc. (501 Fifth Ave., New York), is at hand, giving the names of seventy-four organizations, societies, etc. (including certain State Legislatures—such as Maine, New Hampshire, Michigan and Washington), that have recently passed resolutions calling upon the Federal Government to place an absolute embargo against Russian products.

General W. N. Haskell (Chief of the American Relief Administration in Russia, 1921-23), upon his return from a recent visit to Russia, said that the Soviet Government needs the world's help today to build herself up so she can be independent of the rest of the world. "If, to-morrow, all trade with Russia were stopped and technical assistance withdrawn, the whole Five-Year Plan of industrializa-

tion would crash to earth, factories half built would remain unfinished, production in operating plants would fall off, and thoughts of succeeding plans would end. The Communist State, for the present at least, cannot go it alone. . . . To obtain the help of the world, which she so vitally needs, Russia dangles large profits before the eyes of hungry and perplexed foreigners, relying on the stupidity of capitalists and the selfishness of nations to make the bait effective. Here, moreover, she brings into practice her theory that economics and politics are definitely linked. With her present established contacts and the absolute political control of all her foreign trade, she can punish discrimination against her by the complete withdrawal of purchases from an offending nation and the transfer of orders to one more favorably inclined. Thus, she can play the capitalistic countries one against the other to her own great advantage, not only as a shopper, but as a compensator for political friendship. When favorable credit or marketing facilities are offered, Russia replies with buying orders. She has concluded trade agreements with Germany which involve guaranteed credits up to \$200,000,000, and with Italy for nearly half that amount."

The political and economic rivalries of the Western European powers and their one-time ally—the United States—are conspicuously in evidence; and Russian Soviet diplomacy finds vast maneuvering possibilities in the competitive conflicts, mutual distrust, lack of confidence, and underlying jealousies of capitalistic and the so-called leading Christian nations.

Russia is one vast army camp, fully disciplined

and controlled, with one plan, one policy, one interest, one goal, one party and one absolute despotic dictator. The capitalistic nations known as the Great Powers are not united to help each other or even organized to help themselves separately; they, therefore, are in no material, moral, or psychological condition to combat Russia, which seeks and is planning to destroy them. The democratic people, the capitalistic countries, and the nations of Christendom are, as usual, a divided world, full of selfishness, jealousies and mutual distrust. There has never been a united anti-Russian front—even during the period of blockade and intervention. Britain, France, Italy and Germany seem to revel in being at loggerheads with each other, and each of them with the United States; all are constantly seeking for selfish advantage and jockeying for position, etc.

Soviet diplomacy has been successful in the past in playing on the antagonisms, prejudices and jealousies of foreign powers and in utilizing foreign appetency and competition for commercial advantage and trade with Russia as a means of exerting pressure for the attainment of political objectives. Russia punishes any capitalistic nation for any act of claimed unfriendliness. Britain, France, Italy and Germany have all felt Stalin's whip, and all sooner or later seem to bow down to the Russian Soviet Dictator and lick his mud-en-crusted and bloody boots—if, by so doing, they can get business.

Furthermore, under the depressed and pessimistic conditions existing generally in the world

to-day, certain countries are being influenced by some of their industrialists and bankers to "stretch a point" and, in an existing emergency, "take a chance" in order, it is said, "to reduce unemployment" in the homeland—actually, to temporarily "feather their own nests." A reputed, and rather boastful and proud, enlightened democratic and Christian people seem to be less enlightened in an emergency, and have leaders trying to climb into the saddle who, to selfishly gain a few miserable dollars, are apparently quite willing to forget or change their principles—both Christian and economic.

We read in the press an inspired Moscow item, handled through their American Agency (the Amtorg Trading Corporation), which is the Russian Communist commercial and executive headquarters in New York and the United States, which says: "The officials of the Russian trading corporation warn the United States that, if Soviet products are excluded from the country, the American exporters can say 'good-bye' to their sales in Russia, which are five times as large as American purchases there. If such an embargo actually goes into effect the difficulties of maintaining friendly relations, particularly in the absence of any diplomatic representation, are obvious." If, as the Russians further state, "all purchases by the Soviet Union in the United States will automatically cease if the United States Treasury Department places a complete embargo on Russian goods," the situation would be simple, and American business, American labor and American institutions would be protected by

strict enforcement of the law operative on January 1st, 1932, that forbids the importation into the United States of any products made or handled by forced labor. Unfortunately, the matter, and the solution of it, is not so simple, and Russia will undoubtedly continue to purchase in the United States the mechanism, equipment, and also the inventive, designing and executive brains that she needs and cannot get elsewhere—unless she is prevented from doing so by Federal law.

Soviet Russia threatening to discontinue all purchases from the United States, if we place an embargo on Russian goods seeking to enter this country, is more bluff than serious intent. Russia will buy from America the machinery and commodities that she cannot get anywhere else—provided the United States will sell them to her. There is no sentiment in transactions entered into by Russia; only cold and keen business. If Germany, Britain, Italy, France, Japan, or any other country has a better machine, or a better commodity, that is what Russia wants and will scheme to get. If, say, Germany and the United States make a machine of equal merit and of equal efficiency, then the lower bidder for the business gets the order, unless one nation is willing to accept part cash in payment and extend credit over a period of time for the balance, and the other demands full and prompt payment in cash before shipment is made. Russia, to-day, is selling some thirty million dollars' worth of "dumped" goods annually in the United States and buying machines, etc., over here that cost about five times

this amount. Her business relations with Britain have just the opposite sort of trade balance, so Russia is in reality obtaining money from the sale of her goods in Britain and is using the money, not to buy machines, etc., from the British, but from the Americans. The reason is that Russia can get the type and quality of machine she needs in the United States and cannot do so in Britain, or else the Americans are underselling the British. In any event, the Russians are doing what they deem is the best thing for themselves; they consider no one else, and they most assuredly will not "bite off their nose to spite their face." If it is to the ultimate advantage of Russia to obtain machinery, or any other commodity, in the United States, they will do so, provided we will sell to them. Recognition or non-recognition, our receiving their imports or refusing to permit them to enter the country, has no bearing whatever upon the situation—provided Russia can sell her export goods somewhere else and raise the cash needed to do business with the United States. Credit, however, is naturally a very important factor in Russia's dealings with any foreign nation, and if Russia can get the machines and commodities she needs from nations that will give her large and well-extended credit, then those nations, if their prices are kept somewhat in line with the general market, will get the Russian business.

What is the policy of the United States with respect to our national protective laws and the strict, unemotional and non-political enforcement of them in so far as foreigners and foreign interests are concerned? This question might well

be asked with specific reference to the Soviet Union and their activities in, and trade with, this country. According to press reports, Ivan Matveef arrived in the United States early this year from Russia to buy tool machinery for the Soviet Government. While on temporary credentials he became a vice-president of the Amtorg Trading Corporation, thus violating immigration regulations with respect to an alien transferring his activities while in the country. Secretary of Labor Doak, when made aware of the facts, and in the proper exercise of his duties, moved to deport him, in harmony with the provisions of the law. United States firms selling tool machinery through Matveef to the Soviet Union protested loudly to the White House. Last week it was said that President Hoover, anxious to retain Soviet trade, had interceded with an order to Secretary Doak to adopt a more liberal policy toward Russian business men, and it is understood that Matveef will remain in the United States. If press reports are correct, this episode may be viewed as a straw that shows which way the wind is blowing in administrative circles in Washington.

It has been said that it is a well-known fact that the official information emanating from Soviet headquarters must be heavily discounted because of (1) the Bolshevik bias against facing unpleasant facts and its leaning toward blatant, loud-speaking propaganda, and (2) the absolutely dishonest Soviet policy of "The end justifies the means," which results in false statements, evasiveness, deliberate omissions and artful wiles; and

if these do not attain the objective, then the heavy batteries are brought into play of plain, unadulterated, but forceful, lies and crude, brutal perjury. The most consistent thing about a Russian Communist and the Soviet Government is that they play always to win, and they are never deflected from their pathway to the goal by any such mollicoddle bourgeois characteristics as truth, honor, or justice.

Our present law prohibits goods being imported into the United States which have been produced or handled by convict labor. We are not now speaking of forced labor (which our Federal Law, —operative Jan. 1, 1932, clearly covers), but "convict" labor, which is the work of people who have been convicted of crime—whether political or "class" offenders; plain malefactors, criminals, or felons. A man declared guilty and sentenced to a jail, a mine, a forest, a village, a railroad, or a ship's loading-pier is a convict, if he is robbed of freedom and is compelled to work under the domination and surveillance of officers of the government or starve. Goods are being brought into the United States, and have been coming in steadily for years, handled by Russian convict labor. All the exiled, the deprived, the declassified, who have been moved to sections of the Soviet Union to work under police and armed supervision like brutes, are convicts. They are compelled to work, as directed, for their keep, and they cannot escape. Affidavits to the contrary, prepared by the Soviets and handed to our Washington officials by interested and selfish American purchasers of cheap commodities, with strong but

decidedly non-patriotic and un-American recommendations, are absolutely false and are "cooked up" by an unscrupulous Soviet government, void of all moral sense, to satisfy a gullible and trustful administration of a notoriously innocent, honest and guileless people.

The United States is so simple, erratic and inconsistent that Europe is kept surprised—if not amazed; and Russia, confused and bewildered. Accustomed, as Russia is, to an absolute dictator, who moves and switches, but, nevertheless, at any one time and at all times, has some definite policy—which, as far as the Russians are concerned, is clearly stated,—they find it exceedingly difficult to read of Representative Fish's investigation and anti-communist report of the Special Committee of the Congress of the United States and of certain embargoes—actual or threatened,—yet, at the same time, see large shipments of American machines and a veritable army of American engineers and mechanics entering the Soviet Union to help Communists build up Russia into a great and independent military, industrial, agricultural, Communist, anti-democratic and anti-capitalistic state. No wonder the average Russian asks: "If America does not like, and does not want, Communism in America, why are they helping us to build up Communism here so that we can spread it to the people all over the world?" And their answer is probably that which appears in the school children's text-book, as written by M. Ilin, on "The Story of the Five-Year Plan," which says, "Foreigners are not pleased with our Plan; they would hamper us in every possible way. They realize that we are

building and extending Communism, and under Communism there is an end to their profits. Why then do they sell us machines at all? Because they want buyers of their machines, and love money; because they must sell their machines. Ford, the American millionaire, expressed the American attitude when he said, 'It is difficult to refuse the dollar of to-day for to-morrow's dollar.'"

Great Britain is being pauperized to-day by a Socialistic and so-called Labor Government that for short-sighted asininity is a prize exhibit. The party in power tries to carry water on both shoulders and spills from both containers all that they endeavor to carry. The great British Empire is running dry. Britain is an industrial nation, and most of their foodstuffs and many other raw materials have to be imported. Britain in pre-war days, with a tremendous merchant marine, a vast loyal dominion overseas and all sorts of preferential foreign connections, concessions, understandings, etc.—which supplied her with most of her imports and was a great market for her exports,—enjoyed the fundamentals making for prosperity. She was substantially a free-trade nation and could well be so to a great degree, for she was primarily a manufacturing nation and the world's banker, and was absolutely dependent for food and for other commodities—essential for her continuance as well as prosperity—upon foreign or colonial peoples.

Since the termination of hostilities in 1918, Britain has lived in the past rather than in the present, and, aside from a few occasional lucid moments, has failed to perceive (1) the changed

conditions in her empire and (2) the Russian menace which threatens her far more than any other nation on earth. The Socialist Party in Britain instinctively shrinks from being "unkind to," or "misunderstanding," the Government of the Union of Socialistic Soviet Russia. The word "Socialist" means so much; what it actually is, and what it is doing, is either not seen because of a peculiar "Intelligentsia" blindness, or it is excused or ignored in the interest of believed, but absolutely false and vicious, labor solidarity. The conditions prevailing to-day in India, Afghanistan, Persia, Egypt, Africa and the East, so distressing to the British, are primarily caused by Russian Communists.

During the Miners' Strike in England in 1926, the Russian Trade Unions—absolutely under the control and domination of the Communist Party and its dictator—contributed five and a half million dollars to the support of the English strikers, with the object of embarrassing the British Government, of weakening a great nation, and of making an international gesture suggesting that Communism stood for the brotherhood of man and the rise to power of the proletariat. It was Stalin himself who said that this money—forced from a most unwilling and impoverished people—was a strong attack behind the enemies' lines, as Russia needed peace, not only to build herself into a dominant, but to a strong defensive position, and five and a half million dollars, squeezed out of Russian labor, was a small insurance premium to pay against hostilities—threatening at the time, because of communist

propaganda (directed from Moscow) in Britain, India, and elsewhere in British possessions and spheres of influence. It was openly stated in Russia that British miners and British labor in general would never, because of the self-sacrificing generosity of their Russian proletarian brothers, either wage war or support a war undertaken by a British government against the Soviet Union; that they would cripple industry and transportation, and prevent the mobilization and movement of all troops directed against the "Russian Workers' Government"—which calls itself "The First Workers' Socialistic Republic of History."

Britain, to-day, wants cheap food and cheap raw materials. Instead of patronizing her colonies and bringing, thereby, some prosperity to her dominions, she shops around and buys, at low and "dumped" prices, tremendous quantities of food, lumber, oil products, household supplies and other commodities (even cotton) from Communist Russia, who is seeking the destruction of the British Empire.

Britain, a capitalistic nation par excellence, with a very vulnerable, far-flung world empire, is by far the largest of Russia's foreign markets—for the sale of cheap goods. If Britain in buying from Russia was promised, or expected, reciprocity in trade, she should be disillusioned by this time, for Russian purchases from Britain were only 28.5 per cent. of her sales to Britain during the past year. Russian trade to-day is capitalizing the existence of the British "Socialist" Government to Britain's detriment, and is using her as an "easy mark" and a "free trade" market in

which to obtain money to spend primarily in America in the purchase of machines and industrial equipment.

The United States, unfortunately, is Russia's principal supporter in her plan to become an up-to-date industrial and military nation, for America's dealings with Russia during the past year showed a trade balance of some two hundred and fifty million rubles in favor of the United States, which can be compared with British-Russian trade showing a trade balance in favor of Russia (and, therefore, against Great Britain) of some two hundred million rubles. Russia is selling in Britain some six per cent. more goods than she is buying from the United States, and Britain is selling Russia only thirty per cent. as much as Russia is buying from the United States.

Britain needs to protect herself with a proper tariff, co-operate fully and sympathetically with her Colonies, look to them primarily for food-stuffs and raw materials, and, reciprocating in an economic sense with her Colonies and dominions, protect as well as develop her overseas markets. Of all the nations on earth, Britain should be, not only cognizant, but fearful, of the Russian menace and should energetically wage an economic war to the death on the Soviet Union.

On May 12, 1927, the British police raided Arcos, the Soviet trading organization in London, and two weeks later the British Government, fully satisfied as to the Communist activities of the Russians in Britain and of their violation of the terms of the Trade Agreement in effect, communicated to the Soviet chargé d'affaires its de-

cision to terminate diplomatic relations between the two countries. Russia immediately commenced a policy of inflicting economic reprisals on Britain by diverting a considerable number of orders, that would supposedly have gone to Britain, to other countries. Soviet orders placed in Britain declined from \$113,000,000 in 1924-25 to \$28,000,000 in 1927-28.

British business grew restless over the situation, for British industrialists did not enjoy seeing other "pigs" gorging at the Russian feed-trough while they were hungry. A large number of British delegates visited Russia, but their efforts to make sales were futile. Pyatakov, of the Soviet State Bank, speaking with the full authorization of the Russian Government, notified the British business men that "broad economic co-operation between Britain and the developing industrial and commercial life of the Soviet Union is possible only on condition that normal diplomatic relations between our Governments are restored," but he added that, if this condition were met and "the working-out of a mutually satisfactory financial arrangement were completed" (which meant a substantial "loan" or long-term credit), Russia would find it possible to place orders with Britain "to a total amount of some three-quarters of a billion dollars during the next five years."

When the British Labor Government came into power in 1929, British industrial leaders, in the throes of declining business volume, low prices and unemployment, backed up the Socialist Labor Party, and diplomatic relations with Russia were

resumed. It is unnecessary to add that Britain has never received, and never will receive, from Russia the volume of business anticipated and virtually promised.

The United States and Great Britain should separately and co-operatively lead in a world movement to place the Russian social plague in an effective quarantine, and the Russian blustering gangster in a straight-jacket, by the suspension of all trading between the English-speaking nations and the Soviet Union. Germany, needing credits for herself, but still rich enough apparently to extend credit to Russia, should be taught that assistance rendered Germany by the United States, Great Britain and France is not to be used in financing Russia, incurring favor with, or in cementing still more a subtle Russian-German understanding that has been in existence since Germany supported Lenin in the "Red" Revolution, an act which the Prussian junkers expected, and firmly believed, would win the World War for Germany.

Germany has steadily maintained a peculiar and (to the real thinkers of Western Europe and America) most suspicious relationship with the Soviet Union. It can be described as a cautious and conditional, but, on the whole, a consistent friendship, with each of the two great nations (that after the war were considered "beyond the pale") making friends and tying up more or less with each other for their mutual benefit, and as a threat to weaken the morale and lessen the pressure exerted against them by the Allied nations following the Versailles Treaty. In 1922, Rathe-

nau, of Germany, and Chickerin, of Russia, surprised and scandalized the Geneva Conference, then in session, by signing a treaty whereby Germany—the first among the Great Powers—granted full recognition of the Soviet Union and renounced all claims to compensation for pre-war debts and nationalized properties.

It is most surprising that the German Government has never made an issue with the Soviet Union with respect to Moscow-directed Communist propaganda in Germany. The Communist Party in Germany is the largest and strongest in the world, outside of Russia; it is dominated by Moscow and is obedient to its master's voice—and yet Germany stands for it without a protest. Now, with the plebiscite in Prussia for the overthrow of the Reichstag—inspired by the nationals and Hitlerites—going against them (after Moscow had ordered them to support it vigorously), the Communists are reverting to type, and, we hear by cable, have left the polls (where they are being beaten) and are taking to the streets, to fight, terrorize and kill. The proletarian communist is of the gutter; that is where he belongs, and it is in close proximity to the gutter, and not in an assembly hall or with a ballot, that he wants to fight.

Germany has been a heavy borrower in foreign money markets, and the United States has been the most gullible of the foreign investors in Germany, Britain rather liberal, and France consistently conservative and cautious. Germany has been reckless in the use of the money that she has obtained from foreign sources; she has squandered

much of it in non-essential and non-productive channels that make no direct or tangible economic return; she has been passing some of it over to Russia, and, lately, has been guaranteeing, as a State, credit to the Soviet Union.

France, Britain and the United States, when co-operating to help Germany with her finances, should keep a firm hand on Germany to prevent her passing favors on to Soviet Russia. Moreover, Germany should (but most probably will not) co-operate fully with the other powers of Western Europe and the United States to close the Russian border for the passage, either way, of raw or manufactured goods and machinery, and also make the blockade effective to keep Communists in Russia, where they belong and where they would be needed in the finishing of their grandiose Five-Year Plan if the great democratic and so-called capitalistic and "Christian" powers had enough honor and sound sense to co-operate with each other and the vision and courage to protect themselves.

In Russia it is said that Germany is establishing close commercial and political relations (the latter camouflaged) with Russia. From a Russian source we hear that there are in reality fifteen million Communists in Germany, and if the Moscow dictators were ready, and so decreed, a revolution could be precipitated in Germany within one year at the outside, and Germany be made communist and an active part of the International. "Meanwhile, German industrialists," it is said, "are helping get Moscow ready to do the job." And, again, we hear that "the insensate greed

which causes capitalists in non-communist countries to equip Soviet Russia for the economic and military conquest of the world justifies the communist dictum that 'capitalism' is bent on committing suicide."

During the first four months of the current year, orders placed by the Soviet Government with Germany are stated officially at 102,700,000 rubles as against 74,400,000 for the same period a year ago—an increase of forty per cent. Recently, a Russo-German treaty of amity was renewed and German credit established to facilitate Russian purchase of machines, metal products, chemicals, agricultural requirements, etc., from Germany. The Rapallo Treaty of 1922 continues substantially in effect, with its mutual understandings, both political and economic, but one provision is in effect that if a coalition be formed for the purpose of establishing an economic or financial boycott against either one of the contracting parties, the other will not join and be a party to such a coalition. This is significant and should be kept conspicuously in the foreground when financial plans are being developed to assist Germany and the agitation is again revived to still further revise German reparations.

Recently, Litvinov, the Russian Commissar of Foreign Affairs, has urged, at Geneva, the adoption of "an economic non-aggression pact" between European nations. The Soviet Commissar described his scheme as a negative corollary to a "most-favored-nation" clause, guaranteeing the signatories against special discrimination or "specific deleterious treatment" in the economic

field. In urging prompt action on his proposal, the Soviet delegate asserted that its adoption would go far "toward terminating an atmosphere of distrust which now prevails among nations." The Soviet Government is fearful of intelligence beginning to assert itself in the numbed minds of the industrialists and governments of capitalistic and democratic countries. They know that, when the truth becomes generally known, economic alliances will most assuredly be formed to quarantine the Soviet Union and hold her corrupting and contaminating social (political and economic) disease in check. It is significant that the French representative at Geneva opposed the Soviet proposal, but Julius Curtius, the German Foreign Minister, said, "The Soviet non-aggression scheme conforms to the spirit of German policy, which works for an economic pacification of Europe simultaneously with political pacification."

The German Foreign Office, it is understood, is now behind a proposal of a Five-Power pact to be entered into by France, Germany, Britain, Italy and Soviet Russia, which would pledge the countries named to refrain, without common consultation, from political or economic action affecting any of the others and preclude any coalition that should be hostile to any one of the signers. Both Russia and Germany are said to be enthusiastic about the proposed pact; Britain, it appears, "is rather favorably inclined"; Italy, indifferent; and France naturally, and most rightly, suspicious. Russia is resorting to every possible means to strengthen her position and prevent the

capitalistic nations from forming an economic alliance against her, and Germany seems to have assumed the rôle of both a Russian friend and cat's-paw.

The position and attitude of Germany with respect to the Communist program of the Soviet Union is both puzzling and disturbing. It might be well for France, Britain, Italy and the United States to consider carefully the object of the recent visit to Russia of General von Hammerstein, Commander-in-Chief of the German Reichswehr, and the claim made that the Red Army is being "high-officered" and trained by Germans. The following illuminating paragraph, referring to the Russian Army, is copied from a report sent to the War Minister of a great European power: "The training becomes better each year. Apparently it is in accord with the modified German doctrines and is believed to be under a certain amount of supervision by Germans of officer-experience, either temporarily or at least recently retired from the German Army."

If anything is done by the United States, Britain and France to substantially assist Germany to rehabilitate herself, the general plan adopted should be specifically tied up with a definite and unyielding insistence on an absolute severance between Germany and Russia with respect to trade and to all economic, political and military relations, with their multifarious ramifications. Under existing conditions, Russia is economically, politically and spiritually an outlaw, or should be, in so far as democratic and peace-loving nations are concerned, and with peoples

who stand for human justice to all and the brotherhood of man. Germany's hands, in her relations to and contracts with Soviet Russia, are far from clean; and the United States, being both guileless and relatively rich, is not only deemed "fair game" by all foreign countries, but is notoriously the greatest "easy mark" in the history of nations.

France naturally fears and is suspicious of Russia, but, for some queer reason, France also fears the United States and has no love for Americans. France, like all other European peoples, is fond of the money of Americans and delights in getting her hand on some or on much of it, but the United States irritates France as a nation and as a people, and there is no affection (not to mention gratitude), or confidence, or those feelings upon which co-operation is built, in existence. To-day, France pictures the United States, not only as Uncle Shylock, but as a menace in the realm of industry and machinery as she views Russia a menace in agricultural products. In international affairs, the United States are children, mere "babes in the woods"; we irritate France by our ignorance, gullibility, and wrongly-directed and applied emotional "idealism" more than by our underlying motives. Moreover, we act and then think, or else think and don't act. In the realm of diplomacy we, as a people, are very undeveloped, and we neither think the thoughts nor speak the language of Europeans. France and America, the two great democratic-capitalistic Republics of the world, should understand each other better and be friends, and should unite to oppose and defeat the Communist

threat which daily grows greater and more formidable.

France naturally fears Germany's friendship and co-operation with Russia. Her relations with Poland and the Little Entente are primarily based upon an alleged threat from Germany. Soviet Russia hates and has her eyes on Poland and other bordering states, but that is of the future. To-day, Russia's domestic problems and her need to work against time to overcome her backwardness and become independent in a military and industrial, as well as an agricultural, sense make it virtually necessary for Stalin to adopt a policy of "Peace"—at almost any price. The spirit in Germany to-day is such that it is extremely doubtful that any German army could be influenced by any German government to march or stand against a Red army of Russians. At a celebration in Berlin commemorating the anniversary of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Moscow, it was openly stated (and enthusiastically received) that if war broke out between Germany and Russia, the average and typical conscripted German soldier of 1931 would recognize that he was a member of the Red International Army and that the Russians are his brothers, fighting for the predominance of the working man.

A Franco-German rapprochement would contribute to the peace of the world only (1) if Germany had a stable government that could continue in power, with a strong majority of the people behind it, and (2) that Germany acted honestly and stopped flirting with and substantially assisting the Russian Soviets in a military as well as a political and economic sense, and definitely terminated their

present policy of "carrying water on both shoulders." It is probable that the Hitlerites, extreme nationalists (who are not only imperialistically Pan-German, but, in many respects, most rabid Chauvinists, with many of the Prussian junkers' characteristics) and the Communists combined would at the polls, on a real division on a question of moment, obtain a substantially larger vote than the Social Democrats and Moderates. Whereas the Hitlerites and extreme, organized nationalists (which include royalists, World-War "soreheads" and militarists) are diametrically opposed, in many ways, to the Communists—the conflict being between bigoted nationalists and equally bigoted "Red" internationalists,—yet the Hitlerites stand and will fight for cancellation of all German reparations and external war debts (with the removal of war guilt and the return of all colonies, etc.), and the Communists, not only for the cancellation of such debts, but the repudiation of all debts to all foreign people and the nationalization of all land, resources, utilities, industry, etc.—in other words, follow in the footsteps of Russia.

An effective barricade and blockade against Soviet trade with Western Europe, British dominions, Japan and America requires friendly understanding and full co-operation between Germany, France, Britain, Italy, Japan and the United States; other countries and dominions could readily be influenced to become parties to an alliance for the general benefit of all capitalistic nations. Any long-continued delay in bringing pressure to bear on Germany, while showing her friendly consideration and assistance with respect to her fi-

nances and her existing and threatening economic situation, will result in probable harm to the well-being and the ultimate peace of nations.

The attitude of the Great Powers toward Russia can be likened to a lot of hogs snouting each other out of the feed-trough of highly-valued, and much-exaggerated, Soviet foreign business; all want their fill, and each hog does not want any other hog to deprive him of all that he himself can devour. The Powers well know all that Russia is and all that she stands for; yet they fight each other to get some business from her to assist their industries for the present, and this, when they must know—if they think at all—that every machine they sell Russia and all the help and technical advice they give her, also all the gold they pass over to her for “dumped” commodities purchased from her, will be used, and is intended to be used, by the Soviets to destroy them, as well as all capitalistic and all democratic nations and free peoples.

It is not only short-sighted, it is both asinine and contemptible for a British or an American manufacturer of machinery, etc., to say, as they have said and are still saying, “We do not approve of Russia, but their money is as good as any other, and if we don’t sell them somebody else will, so we might just as well take the business.” Hogs at Russia’s feed-trough, snouting, pushing and gobbling—and there is not even a hallucination as of Circe’s palace to temper or mitigate the environment or circumstances! It is crude and essentially selfish avarice, crucifying national patriotism and the spirit of the universal brotherhood of man; mere vulgar, senseless swinishness. Manchester, with cotton goods to

sell, pushes and fights for orders from Russia for the building of machines to make these goods, which Russia will produce in quantity and "dump" in British markets, taking the business from Lancashire and Britain. A relatively small profit on a few machines at the moment is deemed far more important than the loss forever of a large volume of annual business in manufactured goods—if it is ever thought of at all. American, British, French, German and Italian industrialists and business "go-getters" are all the same; selfishness and short-sightedness are not the peculiar and execrable characteristics of any one people. Lenin was right in his prophecy, "The capitalists will sell us the spades with which to bury them."

If Germany will not combine with other European nations and with the United States in an economic blockade against Russian import and export trade, and if jealousies with conflicting national selfishness of the various countries of Europe do not make concerted action possible, then the United States should act alone in her own protection, leave Russian machinery and commodity orders (with establishment of credits) to be fought for by short-sighted European and other foreign nations; let each country feel the effect of Russian dumping and deal with it as it deems best, but keep American money out of European hands—particularly German—and demand, as a creditor nation, that the various nations which owe us money pay their indebtedness to us as agreed—and this in a business-like and non-emotional manner.

German reparations are not an indebtedness to the United States, and America has no direct in-

terest in such payments. The countries that borrowed money from us to maintain their national existence must honor their indebtedness to us, and this without any regard to what Germany may, or may not, do. We, as a people, did not ask Germany to vouch for the credit of certain European nations and endorse their notes to us when, at their request and urgent appeal, we loaned them money, and when such money and credit meant to such people both their economic and political existence. The memory of a debtor is woefully short, and with nations, as with people, the creditor is derided and hated—if he stands for his rights.

The United States is not responsible for Germany in any sense of the word. America co-operated with the so-called Allies in the Great War, as they were rapidly approaching exhaustion in both man-power and material resources, and the United States materially assisted in and contributed to Germany's military defeat. This American crusade, undertaken in the interest of European people a hundredfold more than in the interest of America or of Americans, cost the United States eighty thousand dead, two hundred and seventy-five thousand known casualties, increased our national debt more than twenty-five billion dollars, upset our whole economic and social balance, and set us back a century as a real democracy. We suffered from the war, considering what we got or can get out of it, a hundred times more than any European nation that was in it and had to fight for its existence, with "its all" at stake.

The United States had nothing to gain by the war and much to lose. We gained nothing and lost

much. We should not now be influenced by "friends" or foes, by interests, organizations, or individuals within our gates or from without, to get into European politics and economic conferences and messes, to be swayed and ultimately persuaded by shrewd and crafty foreign statesmen (who are essentially selfish, and with an inordinate appetency and nerve) and experienced, beguiling economists to "pull their chestnuts out of the fire" and to cancel our war debts in the interest of certain European nations who hate and fear and are jealous of us, and who, moreover, consider us "fair game" for their wit and wiles.

While the various Western European countries are talking of what must be done to save them, would it not be well for the United States, the world's greatest scapegoat, to present the American situation to the world in the generally-accepted, modern, European, economic and diplomatic manner: "As the Young Plan is said to be no longer workable, something must be done, and that at once, to save the United States. The country is in a most precarious condition, with some six million unemployed, and business stagnant; corporations losing money heavily and passing dividends; bread-lines forming and a hard winter coming. The nation is in debt some sixteen billion dollars and, during the past year, operated with a deficit of one billion dollars. The future suggests the necessity of heavy borrowings and increased taxes being imposed on an already harshly-burdened people. To go back to the Young and the older Dawes plan is not enough; we must go back to Versailles. The huge forfeits which the Allies collected from Germany,

and in which the United States did not participate, must be reconsidered. These include the Camerouns, which Great Britain and France divided; East Africa, which Great Britain and Belgium divided; Southwest Africa and Togoland, which Great Britain took; Samoa, which New Zealand received, and New Guinea, which was handed to Australia. When the World-War debts must be readjusted, let the job be done properly, beginning at the bottom. A nation which put thirty-five billions into the war and took nothing out of it has a right to look at the changed map of the world."

The European nations have a most conveniently short memory. The United States took no foreign possessions as a result of the war, and desire none, but we do demand a square deal; and if we cannot obtain gratitude, we are at least entitled to a measure of honest and admitted cognizance of our past liberality, unprecedented in the record of nations, and of our present position and broad attitude.

Henri Berenger, former French Ambassador to Washington, co-author of the Mellon-Berenger Debt Funding Agreement and now one of the leaders of the French Senate, openly affirms that President Hoover's well-intentioned, co-operative and friendly message of June 20th—with its one-year holiday in foreign-debt payments and a corresponding postponement in the payment by Germany of reparations to various European countries—brings to a definite and permanent close the long-established American policy of isolation, first enjoined by George Washington and later embodied in the Monroe Doctrine, which pronouncement of December 2, 1823, demands that every portion of the

American Continent be free from further European colonization, domination and control, coupled with the converse principle that the United States shall take no part in European politics.

Berenger says, "For seven years American bankers have been engaged in entangling the United States with Europe. The investments of American money on the European Continent alone now exceed four billion dollars, while the annual interest return on this money, including the interest from war debts, is more than five hundred million dollars. America has flooded Europe with automobiles, motion-pictures, factories of every description, machinery, electrical equipment, radios, etc. In addition to this, the Americans have associated themselves with Europeans in London, Paris, Berlin, Rome, Moscow, Madrid, Athens, Belgrade, Vienna, Budapest and Sofia. Indeed, the network of steel and gold that America has cast upon Europe has been so powerful that it has become clogged by its own weight. In Germany alone, Americans have financed to the extent of one and a half billion dollars. A crash in Berlin is immediately felt in Washington, and every panic in Frankfort causes trembling in Wall Street. When the crisis becomes worse and extends itself to the City of London, the United States is so entangled that it is in danger of being strangled."

In the minds of many competent Frenchmen of international political bent it is evident that the formidable expansion of American investments and our banking activities and commitments abroad has definitely terminated the United States policy of isolation from foreign entanglements—and this 155

years after our Declaration of Independence, 135 years after Washington's Farewell Address of September 17, 1796, with its clean-cut statement of American foreign policy, and 108 years after the pronouncement of the Monroe Doctrine.

European economists and statesmen (as well as politicians) seem to be in full accord to-day in the feeling that the United States has been "hooked" and that their adroit angling of many years to "catch" the United States is at last successful. The thought behind Washington's message of no foreign alliances or connections, and the Monroe Doctrine, which demands a "mind your own business" and a "hands off" policy on the part of both Europe to America and America to Europe, is, we are told by European most-interested experts, "marked in the United States for derogation," and, ultimately, for "an outright repudiation and absolute change of policy," because the United States, "with its financial stake in nearly every capital and town of any consequence in Europe and in most of Europe's major industries, finds itself willingly, or otherwise, bound up with the fate of the Old World."

The American people should, and can be expected to, have something to say about the foreign policy of the United States. President Wilson learned that the American voters can speak in no uncertain way at the polls, and, after our experience in the World War and during the post-war period, it is only reasonable to expect the American people to scrutinize very carefully the recommendations and pressure exerted by certain of our internationally-minded industrialists and bankers, on the one hand, and our intelligentsia, on the other.

George Seldes, in "Can These Things Be" (1931), says, "In our daily ration of German propaganda at the front, one day a little silk parachute brought us a handful of printed matter which made us laugh. 'Americans,' said the German staff to our soldiers, 'what are you fighting for? To protect the international loans?' We laughed, and grew angry at the stupid enemy. We knew what we were fighting for—Democracy, Belgium, Lusitania, Liberty, and a lot of other things we now wonder about. In the past ten years I have heard many intelligent Germans argue that had the Fatherland taken several billions in American loans in 1914 we would not have taken sides in 1917. Now comes the Yale University Press, which publishes for the Council on Foreign Relations a scholarly and trustworthy volume 'Europe, the World Banker 1870-1914,' by Herbert Feis, which proves unquestionably that the World War was largely the result of the international finance and intrigue which accompanied it in France, Germany, England and Russia." And again, "Britain and France played a tremendous political game with their foreign loans of \$20,000,000,000 and \$9,000,000,000, respectively, and Germany, with a smaller amount, also used it in the making and breaking of the balance of power on the Continent and elsewhere. . . . All the intrigue . . . and all the resultant bloodshed '(threats and exploitations)' between 1870 and 1914 are connected with the rivalry of the foreign-loan interests and their supporting governments."

The United States and France are to-day the "bankers of the world." Is this power of gold going to be used to make for war or peace? The foreign

loans of the United States are estimated at some fifteen billion dollars or more, and it looks as if a large part were not investments for peace. Seldes well says, "American idealism in the past has been perverted by propaganda, tricked by weak leaders, sent roaring patriotically into a criminal adventure from which it took a long time to recover, but it survives." We are very far from a real and absolute recovery as yet, and it is probable that no person alive and active during the World War will live to see a complete national recovery. "If only a small part of that idealism which was once aroused for war can be employed in the distribution of its future dollars, there will be a greater assurance of peace than all the treaties and conferences and encyclicals and Boy Scout Congresses and the plans of European politicians can produce."

American private long-term investments abroad have risen from some half a billion dollars in 1900 and some one billion nine hundred million dollars in 1912 to some \$15,170,028,000, estimated at the close of 1930—an increase of thirtyfold in a period of thirty years, and eightfold in the last twelve years. These figures, prepared by the Department of Commerce, show that in the last eighteen years this country has increased its holdings abroad by about \$13,268,000,000, or about \$737,000,000 a year, excluding the war debts to the United States Treasury and short-term investments abroad. American war debts outstanding on November 15th, 1930, are stated at \$11,640,000,000 in principal, calculated on a 4 per cent. compound discount basis. The worth on June 30th, 1930, of the payments to be received on these debts is given as \$7,-

740,000,000. Direct American investments abroad are stated at \$7,840,000,000 and portfolio or security investments at \$7,204,218,000. Europe has obtained some five billion, Canada four billion, and South America three billion dollars—in round figures—of American money; and of the European countries, Germany has taken \$1,420,957,000; Britain, \$640,892,000; France, \$471,334,000; Italy, \$401,140,000; Sweden, \$272,766,000, and Belgium, \$254,211,000. The great bulk of American investments in Germany have been made since October, 1924, when the Dawes plan went into effect.

The *Temps* (France), in discussion of financial relief to be offered Germany, speaks of international "debts contracted in full solidarity to maintain the war," whereas it has again and again been amply proved that all the United States has bargained for and actually expects to recover of its loans made to France is virtually that part of them which dates from the end of the war, and which, therefore, was not "contracted in full solidarity to maintain the war." France, who has steadily complained about paying any part of her indebtedness to America, but demands that Germany pay her every franc due her as reparations, last year paid the United States some \$40,000,000, but spent \$440,000,000, or eleven times as much, on armaments.

France, Britain and Germany complain about "debts" and get all mixed up between reparations and debts. Germany feels that she is paying reparations to certain countries so that these countries may pay the United States what they owe her; Germany, therefore, says that she is really paying repa-

rations to the United States, for all the debt payments of European nations fall upon her. Germany owes certain countries moneys to be paid as the result of direct losses brought about during the war; the United States is not interested in these losses or in the payment of them. Certain nations borrowed money from the United States, to be used by them to maintain themselves—their solvency and prestige,—and such sums as were loaned by America were loaned to these nations as honorable, responsible and self-respecting peoples, without Germany's knowledge or consent, and without her endorsement of the notes and loans. Reparation and debt payments should not be confused, and Germany must learn that if a debt is owed it is no concern of the debtor what the creditor does with the proceeds of the liquidation.

Great Britain says that she solicited loans from the United States in order that she herself might lend the money to her Allies; she did this, however, to maintain herself in a more or less dominant position as the world's banker. The thesis of British publicists amounts to this—that America should substitute herself for Britain's war debtors. European advocates of the cancellation or partial cancellation of what is due to the United States Government on international loans argue wholly from the viewpoint of self-interest. The United States has the same right to consider self-interest, and, moreover, it is the duty of our administration and of our legislators to primarily consider the financial interest and economic well-being of the citizens of the United States and of the already overburdened few who pay all the personal income taxes.

Calvin Coolidge rightly says, "The debts of the World War cannot be cancelled any more than the destruction of a tornado can be cancelled. Some one must bear the loss." If war is waged, some one must "pay the piper." The billions that went into the World War are lost as irrevocably as the lives lost in that wild and senseless adventure. The money expended by all nations who participated in the war cannot be recovered, as it has gone up in smoke; it doesn't exist any more. That which is lost cannot be recovered by pressure exerted upon the peoples who were responsible for the actual commencing of the war and who were vanquished by military force.

The United States has made no demands on the Central Powers for reparations, and the problem of France, Belgium, Britain, Italy, and other peoples is to obtain from Germany and the other countries associated with her in her recent mad and ambitious militaristic and imperialistic, unscrupulous and unconscionable enterprise, that part of their destructive losses caused by the Central Powers which they can collect from living and struggling peoples over a term of years. A dead nation can't pay and (1) a Pan-German people, with the Hitlerites or the old type of Prussian junkers and Chauvinists in control, or (2) a Communist Germany, won't pay.

As long as Germany is a self-respecting, honorable nation admitted to fellowship with other Western European and American peoples, she should not only acknowledge her financial obligation to certain Western European powers, but do all within reason (and which is not suicidal) to meet and

discharge her obligations. Germany compelled France to pay indemnities, not reparations—as the fighting was on French soil,—after the Franco-Prussian War; she forced France's nose to the grindstone and was heartless in her demands upon a vanquished and helpless foe. Now "the boot is on the other leg," and Germany rebels and whines at taking a little "of her own medicine." France was compelled by arbitrary force to buckle down to work and pay her conquerors, which she did; and the work and self-sacrifice demanded of France operated to make the nation—defeated at arms—not weak, but great.

So long as Germany "bluffs" and "fence-straddles," flirts with, encourages and supports Soviet Russia, and so long as she capitalizes either Communism (primary) or "steel helmets" (secondary) within her own domain and uses them as a threat to certain foreign powers, Germany is not worthy of either economic assistance or of any co-operative consideration of her actual, claimed, or insinuated plight. Germany as she is, if quarantined and outlawed with Russia, would be less of a menace to the democratic nations of Western Europe and America than a cheating, two-faced, dishonorable Germany that takes Western European and American assistance and uses it for purposes that lead to international discord and the furtherance of Communist ambitions.

The question is: "Is Germany to be made to feel at least a substantial measure of responsibility for deliberately embarking on her recent mad, and essentially inhuman, militaristic adventure, and is she to be made to pay for at least a reasonable and

warranted, possible and fully-justified part of the destruction she wrought, or is she going to be excused and go off smiling, virtually scot-free—with more money available to extend credit to the Russians, to wage war against all democratic and capitalistic peoples?"

Europe, for many years, has been steadily planning and stealthily plotting to put the United States—as the world's big and rich "booby" nation—where we, who had nothing whatever to do with the causing of the war or of any of the conditions and sore points of friction and unrest that led to it, and who have lost much and benefited not at all in any way, direct or indirect, by or through the war, will be saddled and burdened in perpetuity with the economic penalty and financial burden or cost of the war. The United States has already borne the lion's share of the economic loss, when all of its financial obligations and legitimate liabilities, in a just business sense, are considered. It is time for the United States, forcibly and in plain, unmistakable language, to tell the countries of Western Europe that the great American scapegoat, already overloaded and despised by the nations that it saved from disaster and annihilation, refuses to become burdened with any more of their sins—the load already is far more than even a self-sacrificing goat can be expected to bear.

The recent report of the committee of ten international bankers, appointed by the Bank of International Settlements at the instance of the London Seven-Power Conference as a "fact-finding" committee to explore the morasses of German finance, could have been written in New York with-

out the necessity of a trip abroad, or of calling a committee together. The "fact-finding" has consisted of, and has been apparently limited to, a mere formulated and official expression of prejudices, selfish opinions, and prejudgments. What are the facts? Where are the facts? What was really done on the ground to investigate, check up on reported conditions, and dig out the facts? An American banker with "large interests in Germany" and elsewhere abroad, who is an exponent of war-debt reduction, with a lower protective tariff and a lower wage-scale in the United States, sits as chairman of a committee which urges revision of reparations and war debts, and downward revision of tariffs and what they do not openly and in candor proclaim—an emphatic attack on the American wage-scale, the American plane of living, and the pocketbook of the American citizen. No wonder the French have termed the report "an infernal machine" and view it with grim distrust; Germany, with exultant hope, and Russia, with gratification and elation. Moscow sees in the American-led International Bankers' Report (1) the probable ability of Germany to help them in the future far more than in the past and (2) the definite commencement of a chain of events that will lead to the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States and the establishment of credit for Russia in the United States—and further credit in Germany and elsewhere, built upon American funds and resources.

Senator Hiram Johnson, in a statement issued to the press, says that the cancellation of reparations and war debts has been decreed by our international bankers, who, he affirms, "are the dominant factor,

not only in American financial life to-day, but in American political life," and he adds, "Their political puppets poll-parrot their Pecksniffian phrases of saving Germany and helping America. They do neither. They protect only their own speculations and profits." Senator Arthur Capper's *Topeka Capital* says: "If the project succeeds, the American people will pay in taxes not only a great part of Europe's war outlays of 1914-1918, but make a contribution to Europe's military budgets for the future. As the Santa Claus of nations, there seems no limit to the notion of bankers as to what the United States can pay."

Already we hear that our international bankers and our industrialists, with some international business and with leanings and ambitions overseas, with their friends of a so-called conservative press and the radicals of our internationally-minded "intelligentsia"—queer bedfellows—are talking of cancellation of war debts and the recognition of Russia to help the unemployment situation and the existing depression in the United States. The recognition of the Soviet Union would be an act of treachery to the people of the United States, and the cancellation of war debts would be analogous to a gangster hold-up, with not only the already overburdened small minority, who are Federal taxpayers, being fleeced, but the entire country bled unwarrantedly and unmercifully. Unless an absolute embargo is placed on Russian goods seeking to enter this country, the unemployment situation will continue to get worse and worse, and for every worker employed in the production of machines for export to Russia, hundreds, thousands and, later,

tens of thousands of American workers will be thrown out of work, American industrial and agricultural profits lessened, and our Federal operating deficit materially, and still further, increased.

International friendliness, interest, sympathy and co-operation, with an all-permeating spirit of human brotherhood, express an admirable and most desirable, as well as worthy, attribute of a civilized, cultured and democratic people. But the loyalty of a true internationalism is not (as so many American intelligentsia seem to think) a repudiation of the loyalty of nationalism, but, rather, its expansion and development. Loyal internationalism cannot germinate and grow from a disloyal nationalism; pro-internationalism is not, and cannot be, anti- or contra-nationalism. One must be loyal to a few and to a relatively small group before one can be loyal to the many, and one must be loyal to the many before one can be loyal to the all. The United States is being attacked to-day by two evil forces, both designated as Internationalism. There is the Internationalism suggested by scheming foreign politicians and economists, by selfish American bankers and industrialists, by a so-called broad-gauged and internationally-minded press, which, in the last analysis, is imperialistic, and by radical, half-baked idealists of the intelligentsia class. There is also the Internationalism of the Communists, which preaches the elimination of all classes and the destruction of separate nations, but which in reality is nothing but an aggressive imperialism of a vulgar, usurping section of an organized lower class, which seeks to subjugate, by force and terrorism, all races, peoples, nations, religious faiths, and

classes under the dictatorship of a small, but highly-organized, part of the proletariat. Both Internationalisms are vicious; at times they war with each other; at times they work together, but at all times both are in conflict with the United States, its people, its institutions, its underlying and pervading spirit, and its traditions.

To "integrate" the United States with the political and economic system of Europe, as now proposed, simply means our country, and our people in general, unwarrantedly assuming a good part of the responsibility of the foreigners' many mistakes and the payment of their obligations and debts with American money. Practically all the schemes of foreigners which stress the necessity of co-operation and the inevitableness of interlocking interests, interdependence, and urge, or even demand, the death-knell of untrammelled aloofness and unhampered isolation, etc. (with its freedom from all fetters and entanglements), suggest programs involving the promotion of the economic and political objectives of their own nations, always, however, at the expense of the American people. Many of these plans "are backed," we are told, "by important, representative and far-sighted American interests," but such interests can be invariably placed in one of two distinctive groups: (1) The selfish and rapacious class, i.e., banks, with international connections, interests and commitments, and industrial or commercial corporations that emphasize foreign business—with their press; (2) the impractical, well-meaning, but essentially ignorant, and "half-baked" intelligentsia class.

We, the people of the United States, can do

more for the world—along real, substantial and lasting lines—by keeping our feet on solid rock (with our hearts warm, but our heads cool); by developing our own country and improving social and economic conditions therein; by protecting and nurturing our home industries, our agriculture and business; by safeguarding and improving conditions with respect to our labor—with reduction of unemployment and a steady advance (not a recession) in our standard of living; by abstaining from “butting-in” to other people’s affairs—even at their earnest (but selfish) solicitation—and by “minding our own business” at all times and under all conditions. We are guilty of a grave error and take an irretrievable, as well as a most calamitous, step if we leave our unique and natural eminence, discard our advantages—unprecedented in the history of peoples (but which can be built far higher with the eradication of our present social, economic and political ills),—and, mingling in the turmoils, confusions, enmities, rapaciousness and jealousies of other nations, on a relatively low plane, virtually offer ourselves to be despoiled. The internationalism and imperialism (1) of our bankers, commercial traders and industrialists with interests abroad (with their press) and (2) of our so-called Radical Intelligentsia will not and cannot result in our raising the standard of living abroad to our present high American plane—which should and could go much higher; but, unless checked, and that with decisiveness, it will inevitably operate to bring down American wages, lessen American prosperity, and lower the plane of living in the United States to more nearly approach that of Europe—

and, at some later day, that of Asia and Africa.

We are now being told that if we do not get deeper into the European morass, we will lose the financial stake that we already have abroad. If, on the other hand, we do go in deeper and keep on going in deeper, it might be well to keep in mind that we shall undoubtedly be smothered in that bottomless bog of what a Premier of a great European nation in honest speech characterized as "a nasty European mess." For the United States, as a nation, to put money into Europe to-day "to save money" is worse than throwing it into the ocean; for such an American-European policy means not only an ultimate greater economic loss to the United States, but the pulling into and submerging of philanthropic and gullible Uncle Sam in the "nasty European mess."

And why should we specialize in our philanthropy in Europe? China is a vast land crying to the heavens for help—and for money. It is now suggested that we loan the Chinese \$300,000,000; if we do, we can charge off this loan and place it in the same category as the 1917 Russian loan. China, however, is fully as worthy of help, and needs it far more than Europe. India also needs help, if we do not know what to do with our surplus funds, our advice, and our "reform" energies. Australia has much in common with the United States, and raids on her treasury have definitely impoverished her; if we can lessen the intensity and frequency of similar raids upon our own treasury for a while, we could go to the help of Australia, if we cannot find enough for our money and our energies—our material, mental and spiritual resources,—to do

in our own homeland. If we do not take care of conditions in the United States, however, "mind our own business," and concentrate much more upon our domestic problems—which are steadily becoming more acute and momentous,—it will not be long before we will have no available surplus for other nations to look upon with wonder and rapacious envy, and no real remaining and usable substance to cause our bankers, industrialists and intelligentsia such concern in utilization as has been evidenced during recent years.

American bankers, it would seem, have made relatively heavy investments in Germany and other countries that conservative and well-posted French bankers, with plenty of money available, would not touch. If such investments, or any part of them, were unwise or questionable—as freely stated in France,—then the fault, if any, lies with the banks and their managements, as banks and private financial institutions, but, assuredly, not with the United States as a nation. If American investors subscribe as individuals to certain foreign securities and are attracted by a relatively-high stated interest yield—always more or less an index of risk—and they lose part or all of their money so invested, the fault is entirely with the investor personally, and, to a degree, with his advisers and the banking group floating the issue, but positively not with the United States as a government, a nation, and a people. The American citizen and the American taxpayer, together with all legitimate American domestic business, American capital and American labor, are not responsible one iota, and should decline to be made responsible, directly or indirectly, for any

losses sustained, or that may be sustained, by American operations for private profit abroad in the realm of industry, trade and business, or in the realm of banking, finance and investments.

The statements appearing in the press—with an ever-increasing persistency and force—that the “non-entanglement” policies of Washington and Monroe—approved, confirmed and extended by the popular vote of the people of the United States in the Presidential Election of November, 1920—are archaic and that “intercontinentalism” has come to stay, show how the wind in certain quarters is blowing. We are told that the world interdependence, which Woodrow Wilson sought vainly to get recognized as a result of the Great War has at last been accepted by American politics as well as by American business. We are also told that the American people (even if they do not know it, or decline to admit it) are one in finance, as is the entire world. This economic “philosophy” ridicules the idea of a banker suffering without the whole nation suffering equally and that the American “international banker” really represents and is the people of the United States. A few thousand stockholders of a bank, or a few tens or even hundreds of thousands of investors in foreign securities in the United States, are only a very small part of all the people of the country, and if every dollar invested by Americans abroad were lost, the effect would be trivial compared with the domestic stock market debacle of October, 1929—for which our internationally-minded financiers were not by any means blameless; moreover, the ill effects upon the nation would be insignificant, compared with the possible

economic ultimate loss to the entire country and to the probable expense of coming military adventures when armed forces are used to follow the dollar abroad and seek to salvage money-power and foreign influence through the shedding of human blood.

If the United States Army and Navy are expected to follow the privately-loaned or invested American dollar abroad—a ridiculous premise, but, nevertheless, exactly what has happened in the past and what our international bankers, imperialists and industrialists undoubtedly expect and subtly suggest in camouflaged language to-day,—then the best interests of the United States would be served by putting an absolute embargo on American money going abroad.

It would have been far cheaper for the United States as a nation to have assumed all the Allied Nations' indebtedness to the United States in 1917, then relatively small, than to have entered the war, spend some thirty-five billions of dollars with an irreplaceable loss of eighty thousand dead and two hundred and seventy-five thousand known casualties, sacrifice (seemingly much beyond reclaim) all that we should hold dear as far as our Constitution (and real democracy) is concerned, and this to fight for a great ideal that has proved to be in spiritual substance no "ideal" at all. The people of the United States were buncoed in the Spanish War and flimflammed in the great European or World War. The flag—which means the Army and Navy, American youth (and the nation's best and most-needed blood), as well as American material wealth—evidently follows the American dollar. Is it not, therefore, about time that as a nation we watch and,

where possible, regulate where our dollars go, capitalize our disastrous experiences of the past, and profit by them to the degree, at least, of not making any more of the same calamitous and essentially stupid mistakes?

Our armed forces, our national financial resources, and our means that come out of the pockets of the American people are not used to protect domestic industries and business enterprises from loss, or to make good the investments of banks, corporations and individuals within the confines of the United States. Why, then, should they ever be considered as usable in the foreign business and investment field? An American bank with foreign connections and investments is not the Treasury Department of the United States Government, and an American bank, an American corporation, or an American investor making commitments abroad all do so on their own responsibility and at their own risk. Any profit they make is theirs; all losses that they experience should also be theirs. Money invested abroad may sow seeds of terrible discord and lead to strife, unless our Government is of "all the people," knows what it is doing, and refuses to jeopardize the interest and well-being of the all to protect the selfish interests and investments of a few.

In these days, when erratic emotionalism, on the one hand, and crude or subtle selfishness, on the other, operate to crucify the spirit of real democracy, it is refreshing to read the measured sound and sane opinion of a foreign learned and experienced man on the true function of government. Sir John Simon, K.C., M.P., delivered an address in Britain (April, 1931) in which he said: "Our rulers will best

promote the improvement of the nation by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties, by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment, by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of the law and by observing strict economy in every department of the State." These words are worth more than a mere reading; they are worth pondering over. The average American suffers from egoism and mental astigmatism and is the most flighty, superficial, gullible person on earth. The United States, moreover, is a mere child among nations, no matter how strong, worthy and promising, and is suffering from growing-pains and a peculiar conceit of adolescence. A land ruled by a form of government in accordance with Sir John Simon's formula would be well ruled; and what more can one either seek or hope for? What we, as a people, need is to disclaim what is wrongly termed "reform" and grow solid and honest; seek to promote the well-being of the nation by real productive work, with a maximum amount of productive effort and a minimum of gambling, idle talk and playing cheap politics; confine ourselves strictly to our legitimate duties, our own affairs and, while friendly and sympathetic to all, "mind our own business"; leave capital to find a lucrative course at its own risk—both at home and abroad—unprotected by Army or Navy; eliminate profitless merchandising so that the wage-scale and plane of living can be raised, hours of labor reduced, buying power and use of commodities increased, income and revenue maintained or increased—all

of which makes for national prosperity; come back to the clear and fundamental principles and the essential human "rights" guaranteed by our Constitution, from which we have been stupidly wandering during recent years; defend the individual liberty of man, the equality of opportunity, and the rights of property; substitute justice for a flux of senseless inequitable laws promulgated by prejudice and ignorance, and make our machinery of government simple, economic and effective, with a minimum of bureaucracy—with its officiousness and interference—and a maximum of that liberty which is the foundation of "democracy" and of all civilization, culture and world growth.

The menace of Bolshevik Communism in the United States is not so much the direct activities of Communists in our country—although this is far greater than is imagined, as practically none of it operates in the open and but a small percentage of it is ever thrust into the limelight. Communism operates to attack American industry, American business, the American wage-scale and the American plane of living by dumping goods in our country—without regard to market and price—far below any nation's cost of production; using the money received to buy machinery to make more of such goods in Russia, which in turn will be "sacrificed" abroad and the vicious ring continued.

Russian labor is paid whatever the State decrees; Russian labor is fed, clothed and housed as the State decrees. The Soviet Government can export as large a percentage of any commodity that it produces as it arbitrarily decrees and compel Russians to use and enjoy a little instead of a

reasonable amount, or much; ration that little and charge the people any price that they please for it, in order that the cost of exports can be pegged at a low figure—even down to zero.

Russian “dumping” exports into the United States, naturally rather small to-day because of internal conditions in Russia, are limited only by what Russia can withhold from her people and still keep the inhabitants—or rather the workers—alive. If the Five-Year Plan should succeed to a reasonable degree, Russia will be able to materially increase the volume of her forced exports and literally flood the United States with some commodities—all of which means a lowering of demand for our own domestic-made goods, with lower market prices generally, reduced wages and unemployment.

Eve Garrette Grady says, “The products of American labor cannot compete in the trade marts of the world against those turned out by Soviet mass methods,” and, she should add, Soviet accounting methods and Soviet dumping. “Not only is Soviet Russia a tremendous corporation with an economy of overhead, but she has the cheapest labor on the face of the globe; and by the token of that cheap labor she can undercut any competitor.” By cheap labor is here meant slave labor that works for bed and board and some cheap clothes, and if no work there is no food.

The prominent newspaper man who wrote an official of one of our large New York banks—with extensive foreign connections—and said “I think the menace of Bolshevism in the United States is about as great as the menace of sunstroke in Green-

land, or chilblains in the Sahara" was undoubtedly honest though unintelligent. Sherwood Eddy asks, "Have we no faith in our form of government and its institutions and privilege, that we think a handful of Communists could so easily overthrow it?" The menace of Communism to America is primarily at this time an economic one and can be frustrated by economic means—a blockade, embargo and border-barriers operating both ways. Yet when we consider, as we may have to some day in the future, the operations of force and terror, it is well to know that a few desperate proletarians—goaded on by fervid members of the intelligentsia—caused the "Red" Revolution in Russia, and only two million Communists (or less) to-day dominate and terrorize a population of 160,000,000. Moreover, it seems as if a few gangsters make life at times somewhat uneasy in our large cities, and our "noble experiment" with respect to prohibition has permitted a handful of bootleggers and hi-jackers to honeycomb the nation with lawlessness. When it comes to the force of the Communist and gangster street-fighting and terroristic type, it is not numbers that count. In a law-abiding realm, numbers mean ballot strength; but the proletarian Communist could never win by honest voting, so he resorts to "rods and knives," blood and terror of the Mafia, Apache and gutter type.

It was a very small, but desperate, resolute and fanatical handful of men that became the new rulers of Russia on November 7, 1917 (about a year before the Armistice was signed in the great World War, and some eight months after the revolt of troops that overthrew the Monarchy). In-

deed, it was a group of not more than a hundred fearless and frenzied leaders that actually seized the government of the largest (but war-weary, suffering, hungry and tottering) individual empire in the world. The provisional government of Russia, struggling along democratic lines to found a stable government of the people, was overthrown by the Petrograd Soviet of workers, which handed over power to the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets. At the time, the Bolshevik Party had some 50,000 members, all told, or some three one-hundredths of one per cent (i.e., 1/3,000 part) of the population of Russia. The Bolsheviks did not really believe that they could hold their usurped power for any great length of time, but they did—thanks, in a measure, to the tactics and most ill-advised intervention in Russia of the Allies, for which the United States' well-meaning, but "simple" and inexperienced, administration was, in a large measure, to blame.

The dictatorship of Russia and of the Communist Party and International, says Sherwood Eddy, "tends to take the form, at times, of a tyranny and even of a terror," and "instead of being 'temporary' has a tendency, not only to perpetuate itself indefinitely, but to become even more intense," and he further writes, "This, then, is our threefold indictment of the Soviet system; a dictatorship that extends to almost all of life and that takes the form sometimes of tyranny and sometimes of terror; the policy of world revolution by violence as the only panacea of social deliverance; and the intolerance, bigotry and persecution which spring from the Marxian dogma of Communism."

The question has been asked—Why should the American working man, with his liberty and self-respect, his high wages and high standard of living, his house and garden, his home and family comforts, his automobile, his opportunity to well and broadly educate his children, his many privileges and standing as a citizen of worth and importance, etc., ever wish to exchange all these for the poverty and the hardships, the virtual slavery and suppression of the Russian working man under the proletarian-Communist, arbitrary and despotic dictatorship? The answer is that he does not. The menace of Russia is not that Communists will influence the American working man to willingly renounce all that he now enjoys and throw in his lot with “Red” revolutionists, but that they will first take work from his hands and bread from his mouth by destructive, economic means, depression, unemployment, low wage-scale and industrial unrest—unless prevented by definite and effective United States governmental protective action, and, later, with false hopes, encourage desperate and propaganda-fed men to ignore the ballot-box, and, under the impression that they are taking things in their own hands to work out their own salvation, become tools and, later, slaves, as they build up, under insidious and ever-increasing compulsion, the despotic governing power of the Communist—Russian and International—Dictator.

Rousseau, a sort of John the Baptist of the French Revolution, wrote the memorable words, “All men were created free and now they are everywhere in chains.” In Russia, all men, whether born free or serfs, are now in chains, and that in the

world's greatest chimerical, but greatly-advertised and propaganda-fed, Utopia. The Marxian and other manifestoes that have told the worker that he "has nothing to lose but his chains" apply, with stinging, emphatic force, to the Russia of to-day, whereas in democratic and capitalistic lands the chains of serfdom to machines and industrialism were broken and discarded so long ago that the old German-Jewish-Russian "Red flag" battle-cry to enchained proletarian labor is passé and of a long-past era. The United States is a land of workers, and the "chains" that Americans have to lose are not the fetters of slavery, but most agreeable ones of a different type, viz., some fifty million savings-bank accounts, some sixty million life-insurance policies, some twenty-seven million automobiles (one for every 4.5 people) and some sixty-five million electrical devices in our thirty million homes, used for lightening home labor—not so that women and children can be conscripted for rough, physical work in fields and factories, but so that they can enjoy cultural pursuits and leisure.

The President of the Massachusetts State Association of Mutual Savings Banks reports that on July 1, 1931, the banks had deposits from 3,073,276 people, aggregating the enormous sum of \$2,166,269,831., or over \$737. per account. These savings do not consider, of course, securities such as bonds and stocks, mortgages, notes, etc., owned and held by the people of the State, life-insurance policies, real estate, and all other forms of private property. As the population of the State is given at 4,249,614, it is evident that three persons out of every four in Massachusetts have a "nest

egg" in a savings bank, and if there are a million families in the State, then each family on an average has some twenty-two hundred dollars in savings banks alone. It would, therefore, seem that practically all of the inhabitants of Massachusetts are capitalists (an average of some three per family) and in a Communist state would be marked for "liquidation." It is proverbial that savings deposits in the United States tend to rise in hard times and fall in "boom" times, when many tempting opportunities to make money present themselves. But the fact that about three-quarters of the men, women and children living in Massachusetts (an average Eastern industrial state) possess reserve funds, provides a strong bulwark of confidence in these days, when we hear so much about the need for unemployment relief and kindred public enterprises.

Prof. Paul Douglas estimates that American workers earn about three and a third times those of Russia and that their standard of living is approximately three and a half times as high, and in "Soviet Russia in the Second Decade" we read that on earnings of some forty dollars a month, out of which the Russian worker has to pay for all the necessities of life (with quantities and prices regulated by the government, also union dues, instalments on State bonds, and other decreed assessments and arbitrary "pay-envelope" deductions), yet "on the whole he is fairly contented, he works hard and is indifferent to his food and physical hardships." Sherwood Eddy says, "Food and housing conditions for Russian workers are still often primitive, but no workers care less for their

condition or will put up with more hardships. The strain and self-sacrifice imposed upon the workers by the Five-Year Plan would not be tolerated by independent, individualistic Anglo-Saxon workers, but, along with some grumbling and complaint, is stolidly borne by the Russian working men."

An official Russian statement says that "the Five-Year Plan is a program for the further extension and consolidation of the great October revolution. It is an important part of the offensive of the proletariat of the world against capitalism; it is a plan tending to undermine capitalist stabilization; it is a great plan of world revolution." This Five-Year Plan, openly admitted to be an integral part of the Communist program or scheme of revolution, brands it as a challenge to the safety and well-being of the United States and the stability and continuity of our complete social, political and economic order—our standard of civilization, our culture, our ideals, our government, our institutions, our religion, and our homes.

Russia is at war with every nation of the world to-day. Communism is fighting democracy, capitalism and the bourgeoisie; this middle class, the backbone and substance of all real civilization, culture and progress—material, moral and spiritual,—so hated by the Communists, includes all our self-respecting citizens and the members of all of our labor unions who have acquired anything of value as a result of their industry and thrift—house, automobile, savings-bank account, life insurance, etc. Russia is waging war by means of propaganda. Every day our press prints Russian news. Our newspapers have correspondents in Moscow or ob-

tain, as members of syndicates, the services of such correspondents, and these men are given authoritative "news," which is carefully-prepared economic and subtle political war-propaganda, for our edification and deception. Everything that comes and is permitted to come out of Russia is "inspired" by the dictator and censored by his aides to help the Russian Communist cause; and no American or other foreign newspaper correspondent can stay in Russia (and keep his job) unless he conforms to the decrees of the Kremlin despot. There is no way of obtaining news in Russia except through the central bureaus of carefully prepared and authorized publicity. There is no free press, and all Russian papers print only what is decreed by the dictator. The Russians themselves know that their press is servile, muzzled, and drastically controlled; they know that *Pravda* (Truth) and *Izvestia* (News) are not only censored, but "official" sheets, and they long ago agreed that there is no news in "Truth" and no truth in "News." Foreign newspaper reporters in Russia are naturally fully cognizant of these conditions, but they cannot send any such statements out of Russia and keep their jobs; they do not and cannot act as news hounds and correspondents; they are merely forwarding agents and ship whatever Stalin's staff of propagandists give them. The economic and political news emanating from Russia to-day—from correspondents on the spot—should be placed in the same category as the exaggerated, colored, and absolutely false propaganda that flooded the world during the World War. All such "faked and cooked-up bosh," primarily intended to deceive and to throw democracy, capitalism and the bourgeoisie

off their guard, should be ignored. The authoritative statements of the Russian dictators in regard to their plans and achievements are communist "Big Bertha" shots or poison-gas attacks that are fired, not to inform, but to weaken our morale and to destroy.

A recent dispatch from Moscow, sent to American papers by a correspondent that is supposedly an American, well illustrates the viciousness and intended subtlety, in practical operation, of the Russian State-controlled censorship and propaganda mill, and how an American free press is used—as an essentially ignorant and dominated medium—by the Communist Soviets in their attempts to gain a desired objective, which at the moment is formal recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States and the establishment of long-time credit. This dispatch, inspired by and forwarded at the instigation of the publicity and propaganda departments of the Soviet Union, criticizes the United States for its backward, carping and short-sighted attitude in not extending credit to Russia, and says, "Soviet officials generally attribute these bad credit conditions to the atmosphere created by the Fish report." It further states that the Soviets are much concerned with economic conditions in Germany and inquires: "Will the United States and the Western European countries finance Germany so that both the Russian orders already placed with Germany and the long-time (and badly needed) credit established for a substantial amount can stand?" Continuing, the dispatch insinuates that the way to prevent Communist revolutions in Germany, as well as in other countries, is to keep the workers employed;

that Russian orders for machinery and needed commodities help the unemployment situation in Germany and in many other capitalistic countries, and would help still more if American and French capital could be freed to materially extend Soviet credit and permit Russia to push forward its Five-Year Plan and place larger orders at this time in countries that are suffering from business depression, with its associated unemployment problem and menace. "With these facts in view," we are told, "it is worth considering whether extensive trade relations with the Soviet Union may not prove, as much as anything else, a means open to the capitalist countries of obtaining insurance against the revolutionary agitation at home inspired from without." No brain but that of a Communist could have produced so delicious (or so senseless) a morsel. Americans are, moreover, informed that France earnestly desires to get its nose in the Russian feed-trough once more. "Substantial increases in the last six months in the orders placed by Moscow in Germany and Italy would appear to be principally responsible for the change in the French attitude. French industrialists see no reason why, in a time of slack trade, their German and Italian competitors should be permitted to gobble up orders available in this quarter, and they are believed to have been able to impress the French Government with their arguments." The United States, being capitalistic and as selfish, short-sighted, sordid and rapacious as Britain, Germany, France and Italy, is virtually urged "to come and get its share" at the hog feed-trough, and we are assured of plenty of room if we will accept notes and "promises to pay," instead of

gold, for the machinery and supplies which are so greatly desired by the Communists in order that they may destroy us and all other democratic and capitalistic peoples. After reading such official Soviet propaganda, one is inclined to think that our newspaper correspondents, as well as our industrialists and technical engineers, should be recalled from Soviet Russia, and this for the good of the United States and the maintenance of our self-respect.

In "Soviet Russia and America" (May, 1931), the writer has said: "The Soviets urge that they be permitted to dump their commodities into the United States and sell at any cost which will permit them to quickly dispose of their 'self-denial' commodities and surplus goods for cash; and this without any regard to the well-being of American industry and American business, the demoralization of the American market, the unemployment of American labor resulting therefrom, and the loss to American capital and to American stockholders, with a pronounced reduction in taxes needed to operate our Government. They threaten that, if they are not permitted to dump their 'surplus' products over here for gold (which, to a great degree, are goods arbitrarily withheld from Russian consumption by the Soviet dictators), they will be unable to place orders with American factories for machinery or with American companies for designs, executive supervision, technical counsel, and the product of American brains. The argument is used that Russia must sell, or rather 'dump,' over here if she is to buy American products. She must be permitted to do harm, and in return she arranges and promises not to do good,

but to do still more and greater harm. The money she spends in this country is sugar-coated poison, and it is a great reflection on the acumen of American business leaders that they like the sugar so much to-day that, in order to taste and obtain it, they swallow the economic poison. Moreover, Russian orders for goods, placed so that Russia may build herself up to be a world power and a great industrial and agricultural exporting nation, are not being paid for entirely with gold; the Soviets are struggling to establish a policy of part gold and the establishment of credit—with deferred payments extended as long as they can stretch them out into the nebulous future.

“If America and the European nations had placed an embargo on Russian goods, had refused to either buy from or sell to them and, therefore, had neither permitted dumping in their domains nor extended credit to the Soviets, and if American and European experts in economic, modern and mass production—both individuals and corporations—had refused to become instructors in the pay of the Soviets, the dictatorship of the Russian people by the unscrupulous Bolshevik leaders would have been materially weakened and its end hastened. America fought in the World War presumably ‘to make the world safe for democracy.’ Our industrial and commercial, i.e., our trade, policy with Russia to-day is the very antithesis of our stated war aims. We, as Americans, together with practically all of the countries of Europe, by trading with Russia, teaching her modern methods and supplying her with modern machines and equipment, are operating to repudiate the spirit of

democracy, wreck democratic institutions and overthrow all governments of, by, and for the people.

"Skilled workers, engineers and industrial experts of the world are being bought 'with gold' (or the promise of it) to go into Soviet Russia to teach the native, low-priced, or serf, labor to make goods to compete in the foreigners' home market and throw their fellow countrymen out of work. This is analogous to an American citizen in time of war not only enlisting in the army of a foreign foe, but acting for them as an instructor of military tactics and a trainer of armed forces; in the production and use of modern munitions and weapons of war, and in the actual selling for money to his country's enemy of military and kindred knowledge that would definitely brand him as a traitor to his native land and as a potential destroyer of his fellow countrymen. In essential principles there is no difference between the militaristic and the economic phases of international warfare so far as patriotism, loyalty and honor are concerned.

"The Constitution of the United States defines treason as 'adhering to one's country's enemies, giving them aid and comfort' and, again, 'Treason is betrayal of the people of the United States.' Any corporation official or any individual who is, or pretends to be, an American, who either knowingly and deliberately, or through ignorance, lack of vision and incompetency builds up the power of Soviet Russia to the detriment of the United States, is a traitor to his country, is guilty of treason and treachery and, if an official of a corporation, is a betrayer of a trust.

"It is not enough to say that a corporation bene-

fits at the moment for an asinine, short-sighted, or disloyal act on the part of its active management; the question of benefit or harm, advantage or disadvantage is determined by time, through the period of years and decades. Any executive who, in order to show earnings in the present, sacrifices the future is not only faulty in judgment, but is iniquitous, both morally and economically. Through ignorance, egoism, or stupidity he is guilty of a breach of faith; what he may deem the immediate good is ultimate harm; what he may picture as beneficial is bad in character and nature.

"A loyal executive will fight for his associates, his employers and his employees, his country and his fellows. He will not deliver himself, his company, his fellow workers, or his countrymen over to the enemy. It is unfortunate and deeply regrettable that so many American companies to-day are helping the Russians to invade and economically devastate the United States.

"And what do the Russians say of all this American ignorance, stupidity and avarice? They use us, laugh at us and despise us. They repeat, with mirth and scorn, Lenin's prophecy, 'The capitalists will sell us the spades with which to bury them.' They print in their school text-books that we 'love money' and are so rapacious, short-sighted and slow-witted that we find it impossible 'to refuse the dollar of to-day for to-morrow's dollar.' Moreover, they say 'We must be independent of the calculations of Americans. We must at first buy their machines, then purchase from them machines for making their machines and, later, we will build all our own machines and all machines for making our

machines, and building more machines than we need—far cheaper than any other country can produce them—we will sell to other peoples and ultimately dominate and hold the markets of the world on both products and machines for making them.'

"The old saying 'A bird in hand is worth two in the bush' may at times, and under certain conditions, be a wise adage, but a long-headed, clear-thinking man and a loyal executive of any American corporation, interest, or institution will give up the chance of making a few dollars in the present to gain many dollars and retain honor, his company's and his country's well-being, with intensified prestige, in the future.

"American short-sightedness, American avarice of the moment, American stupidity and American demagogism—with 'party' criticism of everything said, done, or attempted—are disloyally and insidiously assisting definitely and most substantially to make Soviet Russia's diabolical dreams come true.

"America—wake up! See straight and true, cut out politics and prejudice, and get clear-headed! Forget the littleness of the moment and of the one selfish phase or section, and think and work for the whole United States of America—for all of its labor, its invested capital, its physical, mental and spiritual resources; its ideals of government, its humanity; its social justice; its partly-realized (but still wholly hoped-for) democracy and individual freedom, and for the God of our fathers and of our real selves who, we know 'was, is, and ever will be,' and that long after destructive communism has passed from the world and is remembered merely as a hideous dream or a devastating social plague."

A well-meaning member of the American intelligentsia has said that we should deal with Russia along lines which will be best "for the peace and prosperity of the world." That is correct and cannot be questioned, but he goes on to ask, "Has not the time arrived when we should try the method of friendship, recognition and maximum trade?" A quick jump is here made from pole to pole. "Maximum trade" with Russia and "the peace and prosperity of the world" are antithetical—and that to the extreme. To sell a bandit-people the "maximum" quantity of machines for making armaments, munitions, and all those things that build up and equip a nation for absolute independence and destructiveness, is not contributing to "the peace and prosperity of the world." To recognize, support and give economic aid to the development of communism, whose prime, unchanging and unvarying "ideal" is the international and world revolution, by force and terror, cannot contribute to "the peace and prosperity of the world," for communism openly, admittedly and unblushingly stands for the destruction of all democracies, of capitalism, of all bourgeois (or middle class) people, and the theoretical dictatorship throughout the world of the lowest proletarian class—with an actual despotic dictatorship of a small group centered around one arbitrary and unscrupulous man in Moscow.

American industrialists, American bankers, American politicians and members of the American intelligentsia, who, either selfishly or in ignorance, are working for the recognition of Russia by the United States and for American trade with Russia—both imports and exports,—are building, as did

Frankenstein, a cruel and devilish monster that will inflict the most dreadful retribution upon its creators. Unless the United States is deliberately seeking and is anxious to be destroyed "by its own works," it is not only highly desirable, but necessary to treat Russia "in cold and implacable latent hostility" for what she really is—"an outcast and a moral leper," and establish, moreover, an efficient and practical blockade and adequate boycott against her, and simultaneously raise unscalable and impenetrable barriers of sufficient height, substance and effectiveness that they stop the passage of both goods and men from Russia to the United States, and from the United States to Russia.

To prohibit all importations from Soviet Russia by law is a simple matter. We have the required law—the Tariff Act of 1930, Public Law No. 361, Section 307, which prohibits the importation into the United States of "all goods, wares, articles and merchandise mined, produced, or manufactured wholly, or in part, by convict labor, or/and forced labor, or/and indentured labor," and which defines "forced labor" as "all work or service which is exacted from any person under the menace of any penalty for its non-performance and for which the worker does not offer himself voluntarily." The question is, will this law, effective as of January 1, 1932, be enforced? Is the law an honest law, put on our statute-books by Congress in good faith to protect American labor and American business, and one that will be honestly, loyally and patriotically enforced by our administration, or is it just "one more American law" that can be smiled at, or frowned at, and ignored? Time will tell, and the

stakes are of tremendous import to all Americans whether they know it or not.

It will be argued that if the "forced labor" provision of the Tariff Act is enforced, no ban on exports from the United States to Russia is necessary as far as the protection of American labor and American business is concerned. No such ban is necessary if the wall preventing importations from Russia is effective and non-scalable in perpetuity. If we desire to be absolutely selfish, build up Russia and materially assist, equip and school her to be a menace to all democratic and capitalistic peoples on the face of the earth, develop and fortify her so that she can ruin their industries, wage an economic, destructive war against them and, later, engineer a ruthless class-war and a revolution, upset their governments and, with Russian Communist military support, approach another step nearer to the aspirations of the International, then we should continue to ship Soviet Russia some one hundred and fifty million dollars' worth of machinery and commodities per annum, on which certain of our industrial corporations make in the aggregate, say, some fifteen million dollars profit—and on which our Government (and the people) get less than two million dollars in Federal Income Tax—and consider this the equivalent of the thirty pieces of silver that Judas received for betraying his honor and selling his soul.

As idealists and crusaders under President Wilson we entered a war in Europe "to make the world safe for democracy"; the cost to us was three hundred and fifty thousand casualties and a loss of some thirty-five billions of dollars, which may continue to

pyramid for many decades. We fought for no selfish or national gain and have received, and will receive, no compensation whatsoever, except possibly a little reaction of inner satisfaction that, no matter how much we have been fooled and abused, no matter how much real "democracy" we lost in fighting to supposedly give it to others, we, nevertheless, were unselfish; we fought well, we sacrificed whole-heartedly and uncomplainingly—and we meant well. A nation that could give its best young blood and thirty-five billion dollars of its material treasure, under the hallucination that it was fighting to make the world "safe for democracy," should be willing to give some paltry thirteen million dollars a year, or less, from its aggregate private-corporation income and some two million dollars a year, or less, from its Federal Corporation Income Tax, as an expression of its loyalty to mankind in general and of its obligation to the world as a leading, as well as its greatest and richest, democracy. The United States, who fought in such a splendid and single-minded spirit of devotion to a great ideal some fourteen years ago, has surely not dropped so far from its high estate and self-respect as to encourage (for a few relatively contemptible "blood money" dollars) the Soviet Union, with one hundred and sixty million people—led by an unscrupulous and despotic dictator,—to wage war against all the free peoples and all the democratic nations of the earth. The Russian objective, which is the International "Red" Revolution to make the world safe for the proletarian Communist and for no one else, with the deification of cruel force, slavery, and terror, would mean the destruction in all the countries

of the earth of everything that Americans hold dear—liberty, home, family, country, and God.

There are Americans who are selfish and have "an ax to grind," and there are other Americans, honest in motive, but short-sighted, superficial and misinformed, who will endeavor by fine-sounding, moral and humanitarian phrases and pseudo-economic arguments to (1) have the United States recognize Russia, and (2) cancel her just and already greatly-scaled-down war debts with the European nations; the effort would, of course, be simultaneously made to force all nations "to forgive their debtors as the United States has forgiven them"—which means the wiping out of German reparations and the whitewashing, with an escape from retributive punishment, of a people who, under a militaristic Kaiser, deliberately, with imperialistic intent, brought upon the world and upon all mankind the cruellest, bloodiest and most unwarranted war in history. These arguments will be used by selfish interests and by warped, unbalanced and impractical intelligentsia, bringing in the usual buncombe about interrelations, world-fellowship, human brotherhood, idealism, etc., and the evils of isolation and selfish, narrow patriotism—the same hashed-over propaganda that led us into the World War and is destined to lead us into others unless the brakes are applied. The people of the United States have had enough of war, of the wiles, dishonesty and rapacity of diplomacy, and of international conflicts, suspicion, rivalries, ambitions, and persistent, all-permeating unrest; but, while wanting to keep out of strife ourselves—and having no acquisitive motive whatsoever,—it is consis-

tent and necessary that we, moreover, do nothing to encourage and help Soviet Russia, directly or indirectly, to build herself up to be a great and independent military power, equipped with armaments and munitions (and the facilities for making them in quantity) so that they will be able to aggressively move to realize the ideal of all Communists, and plunge the world into its greatest and most horrible destructive war, the Armageddon, that will not be waged between nations, but between classes—involving all mankind.

VI.

SOVIET RUSSIA AND AMERICA

RUSSIA is not a Socialist State; it is not Communistic, in fact; it is not democratic in any sense of the word. The Russian masses, the Russian man of talent or genius, the Russian "average man" and the Russian peasant all know nothing of that "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" which, as the battle-cry of individual freedom, led to the two great revolutions at the close of the eighteenth century—American (1775-1781), French (1789-1802).

There is just as much of a dictatorship in Russia to-day as there is in Italy, only it is a dictatorship of the lowest, with no social justice protecting the highest and the best. Mussolini thinks and works only for Italy, but, under Mussolini, brains are encouraged, genius is nurtured; all classes and degrees are protected in legitimate work and aims, and the whole country has been put to work—for Italy.

Every dictator is compelled to use some measure of force to obtain his objective and hold his position of dominance. Mussolini is a dictator in every sense of the word; he has used and is using force; he has made men "shut up," stop agitating, cease whining and loafing, and go to work; he is developing Italy. The Mussolini policy is un-American, but it is also anti-Bolshevistic; his position, attitude and procedure are contrary to our tenets of democracy, yet Italy is growing sound and prosperous, and the dictatorship which we condemn in principle

is proving both effective and benevolent in operation and is permeated with social justice to all Italians who will acknowledge its domination gracefully, conform to its demands and not war against it.

Russia is governed, not by the people, as is often claimed, but by an absolute dictatorship; oligarchical in principle, but more autocratic, prejudiced, socially unjust and inhuman in operation than was the despotic monarchy of the Imperialist Czars. The old aristocracy, with its arbitrary hereditary privileges, has been repudiated, as it was in France some 140 years ago, but France emerged from her revolutionary frenzy and diabolical orgy of blood with some semblance of individual human rights and some measure of individual justice. In Russia, the individual, as such, does not exist; liberty and equality are unknown. A highly-organized minority of the lowest are in absolute power, and they rule through force and terrorism.

A popular election or plebiscite of the whole people in Italy to-day would return Mussolini to power with an overwhelming majority, but in Russia the Bolshevistic dictatorship of Stalin and his associates would receive only the votes of a small, organized Bolshevik minority and those pusillanimous individuals whom they, with the gun and modernized knout, could intimidate and terrorize.

The members of the so-called and falsely-branded Communist Party and the Communist youth (Komsomols) in Russia, who control and are the governing instruments of Sovietism, represent in the aggregate less than 3 per cent. of the population of the country. The official count (February 1st,

1931) of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union set the membership at 2,040,658—only about 1.2 per cent. of the people. It is interesting to note that during the past year 1,273,000 individual members (62 per cent. of the whole) were called before the inquisitional party tribunals to show cause why they should be continued in good standing; some 100,000 were expelled and about 150,000 were reprimanded for minor breaches of party discipline and put on probation. Under Czarism the nobility and privileged classes represented 1.5 per cent. of the population and the bourgeoisie, or middle class, which contained scholars, business and professional men, small property owners (Kulaks) and even reformers, totaled some 8 per cent. Sovietism has warred against the so-called middle classes, considered in all other countries as the backbone and real substance of a nation, as much as it has against arrogant aristocracy and hereditary privilege.

In 1918 the Russian Bolsheviks, who were the terroristic and deepest red branch of the revolutionary "Socialists," dropped their name, also the ambiguous name of Russian Social Democrats, which they had subtly and falsely assumed for domestic and foreign propaganda purposes, and became, at least by name, "The Russian Communist Party." Why "party"? for all other socialist groups and all other parties and political or social groups were excluded from the government and their death-knell sounded in Russia. The new so-called Communist Party, which is not Socialistic and is not Communistic, but merely oligarchical and unprincipled, spurious sociality, assumed by force a "monopoly of legality," and in Russia no other party is allowed to exist.

In Russia, a man is a machine; he is a mechanical unit of flesh and blood and is treated by the State (i.e., the minority in power) as such; he is assumed to have, and is officially declared to have, neither spirit nor soul; he is a sort of numbered automaton. This applies to the female as well as the male sex and to children in general. Women are working slaves of the Bolshevik dictatorship, as are the men; there is no leisured class, no leisured sex, no leisured age. Russia to-day demands work from all of its serfs, virtually from the cradle to the grave. Workers are considered of value, as were slaves in the South before our Civil War. All non-producers, in which category are placed the old and infirm, the sick and all incompetents, are considered liabilities and are not wanted. Infants and young children would be put in this same class of undesirables were it not for the fact that they are potential workers, are educable and responsive to authority, and therefore are an economic and physical asset to the Soviet State of the future.

Russian Bolsheviks brand every form of religion, and all religious faith, conviction and belief, as mere bourgeois bosh and capitalistic buncombe. They openly denounce religion as mental opium, diabolically administered to the people by self-declared and self-assumed authorities in order to deliberately deceive, stupefy and degrade them.

To join the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a Russian workman must not only be proved "right," but the record of his ancestry for several generations back has to be acceptable to official party examiners. The applicant must ardently profess a way of life which embraces the

whole range of individual beliefs and activities. His admission to the party is by Confession of Faith in an inflexible economic, religious, social and political creed, with avowals and pledges of austere and unquestioning conformity to the tenets of party authority. To join the party one must be a professed atheist; it is significant that many (of the 100,000) expelled during the past year were ejected because they were "suspected of belief in religion" or had been observed attending a church.

In America, machines are the tools and servants of the workers. In Russia, machines are new, rare, and so highly esteemed in an economic sense that they are placed above the workers. The highest court in the Soviet Union, responding to orders from the dictator, has recently decreed that a worker's error in handling or operating a machine must be punished and that carelessness is a crime. A worker who damages a machine, or a worker in whose care and under whose operation a machine breaks, fails, or becomes damaged or unworkable—temporarily or permanently,—is apprehended as a felon, tried under criminal statutes and, if convicted, is imprisoned.

Deliberate sabotage means death, and capital punishment in Soviet Russia is no rare occurrence, for the country is overrun with spies, sleuths and secret police—the G.P.U., the Cheka, and a continuation of the old Okhrana, intensified beyond any numbers, scope and viciousness developed under Czarism,—and the vast disciplined and well-armed military army (of 750,000 men—with efficiency increased by German aid in both materials and training) overrunning the land must be given

rifle practice, so the masses are frequently intimidated by example and inculcated with fear.

Indifferent users of tools, and tired or inexperienced operators who make a mistake, no longer are merely reprimanded in Russia or machine-damage excused as an "accident." The new Soviet decree states specifically that any damage to machine or structures (including that caused by fire) cannot be excused by any plea of fate, ignorance, or of good intentions, but any and all damage must be considered as due to carelessness; all offenders (whether guilty or merely unfortunate), if they have an accident, must be punished—the extent and degree of punishment depending upon the extent of the loss and the moral effect of such loss, or of the punishment for such loss, upon other workers.

It is interesting to note what Russian Soviet courts consider a crime. According to Article 6 of the Soviet Civil Code, "every act or lack of action which threatens the safety of the Soviet order and régime is a criminal offense." This is a sweeping designation of crime and has been made applicable, for instance, to the manager of a factory who merely neglects his job. Inefficiency has been branded as criminal in Russia, and under Sovietism neglect becomes a crime because it prevents or delays attainment of the revolutionary end in view. For first-degree murder the penalty in Russia is ten years' "restriction of liberty," and if a peasant kills his wife he is allowed to go home for "three months a year to take in the harvest." If, however, any Russian commits an offense against the State, i.e., against Sovietism and any of its economic phases and manifestations, the penalty is death, and there

are forty such listed offenses against the State and the organized proletarians in power.

A Russian committing murder may be condemned to ten years' imprisonment, but the penalty for being politically "wrong," for theft, or for making a serious mistake in the State's business is death. Moreover, there are no juries in Russia. The judge is a politician, ruthlessly and inhumanly defending Soviet and so-called proletarian class interests, and he will not hesitate to disregard the laws when they conflict with Soviet principles. This has been called the socialization of the law; the whole system is arbitrary, legalized injustice.

The new American Tariff Law forbids the entry into the United States of any goods made by forced or convict labor. If this law is interpreted literally, it establishes an embargo against all Russian goods, for practically all labor in Russia is forced and compulsory. Workers are herded from mines to factories or factories to mines; from fields to forests; from section to section, and from zone to zone. Where labor is needed it is supplied from localities where the Soviet dictatorship decrees that there is an overabundance of labor. Workers in Russia are merely factory, agricultural, or mining soldiers—or slaves.

The Soviet State decrees the nature and kind of work, as well as its geographical location, pay, and living conditions; supply and prices for food and all other necessities—with the usual American comforts and luxuries, as well as American freedom, tabued. Forced labor is the same as disciplined and controlled drafted army labor, and as such labor is void of all semblance of individual liberty, it is in

essence and spirit convict labor. The whole of Russia is one great prison for the workers.

Russian labor is forced to work under compulsion and is deprived of the right of free speech, free assembly and a free press. The workers are under a relentless and remorseless iron heel. The right to think and to express ideas is confined to the dominant Communist Party, and only Communist sentiments, favorable to the Soviet political and economic systems, including the dictatorship, are permitted to find expression either orally or in print. Every member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a spy, so naturally silence has become golden among the Russian workers; it is the safeguard of employment and protection against prison bars, but it also means physical safety and life itself. Vocovich says, "The miseries and merciless exploitation of the downtrodden Russian workers are shadowed by fear and terror, while the desperate multitude is compelled to shout with grim smiles 'Long live the Dictator.' "

Russian labor is militarized, but unarmed—except for the guards. All the 160,000,000 people of Soviet Russia, party or non-party, willing or not willing, are under a relentless and inhuman régime of forced labor, and must work, if the dictators so decree, at jobs and in places not of their own choosing and with stipulations neither pleasant nor agreeable; and this at an arbitrary, decreed tempo and under conditions that only rabid enthusiasts and "shock brigades" can possibly find acceptable, —or robust, phlegmatic physical health (with subnormal mentality) tolerate. Since November 21st, 1929, Russians by birth, who have refused to accept

Sovietism and have forsaken the cause of so-called Russian Communism, are pronounced traitors and are blacklisted and summarily shot when apprehended in Russia, or at the frontier should they be foolish enough to attempt to return to their fatherland. Bobby Burns expressed a truth applicable to Russia's three per cent. in power—"Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn."

Russia, to survive as a nation among nations, needs (1) modern industrial and agricultural appliances and methods and (2) gold. To make purchases abroad of machines and of such things as it needs, but does not and cannot produce itself, Russia requires gold and credit. To obtain gold it exports part of the commodities and products that it does or can make or grow, and sells such commodities and products abroad at any price that will effect a quick sale and bring gold promptly to Russia or, by deposit, establish Russian credit abroad.

Foreign trade was declared a State monopoly by the Russian Soviets on April 22nd, 1918, and all exports, as well as imports, are controlled in quantity and price by the State. No matter what the prevailing price of any goods is in Russia, the Soviets sell the identical or a better-quality article abroad at any price to effect a quick sale and obtain prompt payment in gold. Such export sales are made by the Soviets without any regard to domestic prices or the cost of production in Russia. If the goods are sacrificed well below the cost of production, the sales price in Russia for domestic consumption is advanced to cover the loss, and all goods sold or dumped abroad, demoralizing for-

eign markets and throwing foreign workers out of employment, is considered of advantage to Soviet Russia to the degree that it brings gold to Soviet coffers,—which gold is used as part payment and in establishing foreign credit for the purchase of machines and other necessary things which Russia wants and cannot make.

Russia can force her people to "tighten the belt," deny themselves all comforts, all margin and all pocket money. With the accumulated sacrifices of 160,000,000 people at its command, it can sell its raw and manufactured goods abroad for any price in order to obtain foreign currency with which to build and equip its factories, farms and mines.

To pay for materials, machinery, equipment, factory supplies and foreign brains, needed for Russian industrialization and "mass" crop production purposes, the Soviet Government must export sufficient commodities to cover the cost. Lacking foreign credits, the Soviets can make only such purchases and commitments abroad as can be covered by the realizing price on Russian exports. Other countries can stand a so-called unfavorable trade balance, i.e., an excess of imports over exports, in monetary value; Russia, in substance and real totality, cannot. Yet Russia is subtle and insidious in its operations, and its foreign trade monopoly has given it, with its absolute and unscrupulous dictatorship, enormous advantages in dealing commercially with other countries. The Soviet Government is the only Russian seller and the only buyer, and it is unscrupulous. It is diametrically opposed to all the principles, morals and ethics of so-called capitalistic nations; it does not hesitate to make

its money legally valueless outside of Russia and give it any value it desires, by law, within its own domain. It has been well said, "The foreign trade monopoly (of the Soviets) is the armor-plate of Sovietism and the greatest menace," as well as the highest protection, "ever devised in international relations."

All gold which Russia obtains from abroad by her dumping tactics is being, and will be, used by Russia to further demoralize the markets and labor of foreign countries. So long as Russian "chain-gangs of labor," or disciplined "army goose-steppers," are employed, and all men, women and children in Soviet Russia are kept busy in productive work as State-slaves, Russia cares nothing about business depression or the unemployment of labor in foreign lands, that is, in any sense of regret; actually, they are elated if they succeed in carrying economic distress into any so-called capitalistic country and in bringing unemployment and poverty into the homes of foreign workers. Soviet Russia welcomes business depression, losses and failures, unemployment, hunger and distress in foreign lands, for they affirm that such conditions will lead to revolutions and the growth of Bolshevism. They actually dream of a world that some day will be dominated by the Soviet dictators of Moscow, and their idea of internationalism is a world of slave-workers in factories, forests, mines and fields, soullessly functioning as automatons under the domination of brutal and unscrupulous Russian dictators.

Russia, "incalculable and galvanized into action" by a group of energetic and soulless, determined

and unprincipled "Marxian dogmatists," requires and compels the individual to either conform to the dictates of a ridiculously small, but highly-organized, minority—fully armed and disciplined, with a horrible secret-service and inhuman inquisitional system,—or else he starves or otherwise passes on and out of the picture. The slogan in Russia is "One must work (for and under the domination of the Soviet Control) or starve." The Soviets constantly admonish the people to "Tighten the belt"; "Sacrifice for victory"; "Starve ourselves to become great"; "Suffer a little now to win much—later." Russia, it has been well said, "lashes a whole people to the wheel of mundane things and whips up a faster and faster tempo to that wheel at a staggering human cost, all to build a Juggernaut so that when the guns cut loose in the next war, which they fully expect and plan for in Moscow, the Russian Soviet Government will be prepared, economically independent and powerful, to advance against crumbling capitalistic countries."

Why is Russian labor willing to work for practically no pay—mere bed and board, with only the crudest necessities of life? One can best answer this question by asking others. Why do the inmates of our penitentiaries work? Why do drafted soldiers in the armies of the world do what they are commanded to do? Why did the slaves on our Southern plantations work? Russia, as far as labor is concerned, is a penitentiary, an army camp and a slave State. Why can the Soviet dictators obtain the support of the young Russians and get them to become enthusiastic members of the Kom-somols and Communist Party? First, by propa-

ganda and by training; Lenin copied the Roman Catholic Church in insisting "on molding the minds and directing the thoughts and activities of the young." Second, the workers are taught that they are working and self-sacrificing for themselves; that the factories, farms and mines are their own physical properties. Third, Russian labor is constantly subjected to dictator-inspired propaganda, which vigorously affirms that Russia is the only land in the world where the workers are not only free, but rule and own the country and all that it contains, and that all of the capitalistic nations are constantly and energetically seeking their destruction. They are also informed that the workers in other lands are "in chains," seeking and struggling to free themselves and follow the Russians in making the revolution, and the ascendancy of the proletariat, world-wide. And behind all this is not only the greatest disciplined army in the world, equipped and psychologically trained to carry out orders expeditiously and without questioning, but permeating the social mass, and mixing with and spying on all individuals, are the terrible and greatly-feared secret police. The G.P.U. enter a room, ransack it, arrest a man, and he disappears; no public trial, no news,—but his friends and family may see him no more.

Mussolini, in Italy, was carried to power by the Fascisti, which he founded in 1919, and the ranks of the Fascisti are composed of ardent nationalistic Italian youths. The highly-organized youth of Russia, even though an absurdly small proportion of the population, maintain by force the Soviet dictatorship; these young men are trained and in-

fluenced by propaganda to have a self-sacrificing, social-martyr complex, but it is significant that their ideal of a perfect "New Jerusalem" of the future is pictured as "a room to oneself and one filling meal a day." This does not seem much of an ideal or difficult of attainment to any worker in the United States of America, and we have to greatly stretch our imagination to follow the statements made in Russia that this, to us, very low goal "can only be realized by a relentless policy of iron and blood through many years." What Russia claims to be striving for and sacrificing to obtain, the worker in America has enjoyed, to a greatly intensified degree, for generations.

The Russian Soviet dictatorship has imposed great sacrifices upon the people. The masses are commanded "to get along with a minimum of subsistence and of goods" in order that Russian commodities can be exported and every possible bit of effort and outlay may go "into the creation of industrial apparatus for the future production of goods and satisfactions." Professor Seligman says that the Russian experiment will temporarily "pinch" capitalist countries because of its so-called "socialized" planning and its unblushing practice of making use, to its selfish ends, of the brains and capital of the United States and, to a lesser degree, of Germany and certain other countries, but he asserts that Sovietism and Bolshevism must ultimately fail, for "the Soviets forget the fundamental force in all life—giving the individual a chance to express himself. That is the foundation of art, philosophy, ethics—and business. In Russia they are going on the supposition that a man thinks al-

ways of the community and never works for himself." That, however, is just as unnatural and just as senseless and indefensible as the ruthless beginnings of so-called capitalism, and infinitely more so than the mellowed "capitalism" of to-day. "So long as they keep to it," he affirms, "Russia is bound to be in a lower state than elsewhere."

Does Russian labor own Russian factories, farms, land and mines? It does not. The people are serfs, and a highly-organized dictatorship owns and dominates the State and its people. To keep functioning, labor is given only the barest necessities of life. If they object or demur, they are told that they own the factories and machines; that no one makes any profit from their labor and that they are all partners—in industry or agriculture, etc. They, as owners of properties and business, therefore must expect and be willing to suffer when economic conditions are bad, but the future is painted in glowing colors. Some day they or their children will be rich, enjoy all comforts and even luxuries, and be "the lords of the earth." In America, labor is paid a fair living wage, no matter whether the factory, farm, or business makes money or not. Labor has a prior lien against property and all physical resources, and must be paid in full before any return is made on capital or any other bills liquidated. The Russian principle, applied to American life and conditions, would initiate "bunk and cook-house" life for the workers, and, in order to have a factory compete with China or India in the cheap production of goods, wages would be cut to a few cents per day, with standardized "Communitic" necessities, but no comforts, supplied. There would

be no private homes for labor, with garden, piano, victrola, radio, washing-machine, refrigerator, vacuum cleaner, automobile, etc., for all such are condemned "capitalistic frills"; they are branded to-day, not only as unnecessary, but undesirable and even immoral.

It was recently reported that the Soviet Dictators behind the Five-Year Plan were being compelled to use "capitalistic" methods to overcome the "inertia and lack of individual initiative and personal interest in output" on the part of the workers. Prizes of seemingly large money value are announced, but the prizes are "collective" and go to plants that win certain contests based on annual performances. A part of the prize values is said to go to individuals for meritorious productivity. Do the workers in the factories that win, or do the individuals who lead in the prize contests, receive money? They do not. The prize won by a plant means that its money value will be spent at or around that plant "to improve living conditions" for its labor, and the individual prizes permit the winners to take a travel trip, the big winners being sent on a personally-conducted tour of a few weeks' duration abroad, where they are expected to spread propaganda and "stimulate interest" in Russia's "noble experiment." If Russian labor do good work relatively and competitively, they are promised, figuratively speaking, some "plum duff" for dinner; a warmer bunk-house or a weather-proof roof; a club-room where they can listen to a radio and possibly smoke, but no money and no liberty, except such as is afforded a dog taken out on a leash for a walk by its watchful owner.

The Soviet Dictators in 1928 "sold" to the masses the idea of the "Five-Year Plan." It was to be five years of self-denial, of "roughing it," of hardships,—but in the end a glorious victory for the Russian proletariat. Now the Soviet leaders are talking of a second Five-Year Plan, and gradually Russian labor will learn the bitter truth that they are not toiling and struggling like beasts of burden or like convicts on a Five-Year Plan, but on a Twenty-five-Year or a Fifty-Year Plan. One of the most serious problems confronting the Soviet dictators must be the necessity of breaking the news to the Russian people that the end of the present and much-heralded Five-Year Plan will not find them entering the gates of a golden Soviet heaven "of joy and plenty," but that ahead of them lie many, many more lean years of sacrifice and self-denial—years of hard toil and physical distress, years of sacrifice and short rations, and years of drafted slavery and servile subjection.

It is surprising that so many countries, whose ideals of liberty, humanity, religion and democratic government are diametrically opposed to Bolshevistic Russian Sovietism, fall for (1) Russian insidious economic propaganda and (2) Russian orders for machines and materials and the buying of foreign brains. In our own country, reputable American manufacturing companies bid for and scramble after Russian orders for machines and equipment, and even contract to build factories for Russia and teach the Russians mass production, processes and manufacturing procedure. How pathetically short-sighted! To gain a few orders or obtain money for expert knowledge and services, reputable Ameri-

cans are teaching the Soviets how to make and how to compete with American methods and products, not only in all the markets of the world, but in our own land. To make a few dollars to-day, American business is not only mortgaging its future, but is killing it at home, as well as abroad—unless American Congresses come to the aid of American industry, American labor and American capital in the years to come, and place an absolute embargo on Russian importations.

So long as Sovietism controls Russia, no country in the world will be able to make goods as cheaply as Russia when that land is equipped with modern machines and fortified with the most modern processes and most efficient procedure. Russian labor, as slaves of the State, are housed, fed and clothed cheaply, simply and collectively; no luxury, no extravagance, no pampering and no frills; no margin of comfort and "no emotional or human nonsense." The plane of living is what the dictators decree, or, in other words, the wage-scale is arbitrarily fixed by the Soviets at the lowest possible and practical minimum, in order that labor may merely live and work efficiently. Soviet labor is treated like the old Southern plantation slaves, like American convicts working out a "hard-labor" sentence, and they are valued and handled just as if they were beasts of burden.

For the present, Russia can dump goods in foreign countries at any price above zero and profit by it. In the future, Russia, under Soviet-forced labor conditions and under the crude rule and mechanistic domination of an arbitrary dictator, will always be able to undersell foreign countries

who treat their labor as human beings, who believe in human liberty, the sanctity of the ballot and a reasonably high plane of living, and who at least attempt to conform to the dictates of democracy and the social ideal of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity," or, in other words, who believe in and stand for humanity and plain, unadulterated social justice for the one and the all.

No socially just, free, well-principled, or ethically-minded country will in the future be able to compete with Russia in the markets of the world so long as the Soviet dictatorship of the Bolsheviks endures. Russian costs of production can be made almost anything, or established at any low level, that authority decrees. The State theft or confiscation of all plants, structures, machines and properties, lands and resources of every kind, money and other valuables, food and all other commodities, with the virtual enslaving of all labor—which is arbitrarily dominated and used—eliminates (1) most of the "overhead" that enterprises outside of Russia are properly, and in economic soundness, subjected to, and (2) the necessity, or at least the humane desirability, of paying labor a "living wage," with the plane of living relatively high, but fully warranted, in accordance with the dictates of our progressive civilization. Taxes; interest on invested capital; depreciation; amortization and obsolescence; insurance, etc., mean nothing in the determination of Russian "costs"; and compensation for labor can be written as low as the wage rate paid to old plantation slaves, i.e., down to the bare cost of sustenance. Labor cost in any country is the predominating item of the expense of any

manufactured finished product. A factory cost may show a "Material and Supplies" expense two, three, or four times that of compensation for labor, but in every "Material and Supplies" item of expense the cost of direct and indirect labor predominates; it also exists in the building as well as in the operation of machines, in freight and distribution charges, in power, light, fuel, etc. Minerals, fuel, timber, etc., have little value in their natural setting; it is only by a great expenditure of labor that such products are made valuable for factory use, even if such labor costs are not reflected as such in the records of a plant producing a specialty from purchased raw or semi-manufactured materials. The Russian Soviet industrial, agricultural and general economic system is positively opposed to the interests and well-being of the worker. It is less anti-capitalistic than anti-free labor, for it makes a dictatorship positively capitalistic, or rather capital-owning—not by earning or purchasing, however, but by theft and piracy; and this capitalistic, unscrupulous and arbitrary dictatorship retains its usurped power and its stolen wealth solely by terroristic intimidations and brutal force.

In April, 1917, the closely-organized Bolsheviks, in power through treachery, force and terrorism, declared for nationalization of the land, and the Congress of Red Soviets, consisting of industrial proletarian highwaymen, who owned no land, decreed that all private ownership in land be "abolished forever, without compensation." The pirate laborers of factories declared that the Russian bourgeois and the Russian peasant-farmer, who by thrift and self-denial had gained title to land and

what the land contained, did not own and had no valid title to said land. It is said that the entire Soviet element in control of Russia to-day consists of 5 urban and factory original non-land-owning members to 1 rural, farm, or land-working member. However, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union state that their members are made up of 67 per cent. factory workers, 22 per cent. farm or land workers (peasants) and 11 per cent. executives, managers, trained professional men, scholars, etc. Those who acquired power, and hold themselves in power because of force, always take advantage of the unorganized and relatively helpless, and evidently do not hesitate to subjugate, humiliate and abuse them, even if they are, politically and in theory, fellow proletarians and brothers.

The Soviets urge that they be permitted to dump their commodities into the United States and sell at any cost which will permit them to quickly dispose of their "self-denial" commodities and surplus goods for cash; and this without any regard to the well-being of American industry and American business, the demoralization of the American market, the unemployment of American labor resulting therefrom, and the loss to American capital and to American stockholders, with a pronounced reduction in taxes needed to operate our Government. They threaten that, if they are not permitted to dump their "surplus" products over here for gold (which, to a great degree, are goods arbitrarily withheld from Russian consumption by the Soviet dictators), they will be unable to place orders with American factories for machinery or with American companies for designs and the product of

American brains. The argument is used that Russia must sell, or rather "dump," over here if she is to buy American products. She must be permitted to do harm, and in return she arranges not to do good, but to do still more and greater harm. The money she spends in this country is sugar-coated poison, and it is a great reflection on the acumen of American business leaders that they like the sugar so much to-day that, in order to taste and obtain it, they swallow the economic poison. Moreover, Russian orders for goods, placed so that Russia may build herself up to be a world power and a great industrial and agricultural exporting nation, are not being paid for entirely with gold; the Soviets are struggling to establish a policy of part gold and the establishment of credit,—with deferred payments extended as long as they can stretch them out into the nebulous future.

The Russians claim that they had a trade balance with the United States last year, unfavorable to them, of some \$120,000,000 as against a favorable trade balance of \$40,000,000 with Britain, \$28,000,000 with Latvia, \$15,000,000 with Italy, etc. The total Soviet foreign trade, they claim, showed a trade balance unfavorable to Russia of \$33,000,000. Russia is shipping grain, lumber, coal, manganese, furs, matches, sausage casings, caviar, licorice root and bristles into the United States to-day, and claims 90 per cent. of her imports are raw materials and only 10 per cent. manufactured "finished" goods. Of Russia's purchases in the United States last year, \$123,000,000, or 83 per cent., represented machinery, the balance being made up of 10 per cent. raw cotton (now discontinued) and

some 7 per cent. minerals, chemicals, etc. Russia demands that we permit her to sell, or rather "dump," her goods into this country if she is to continue buying from us; moreover, she does not want to pay gold for her purchases, but desires extended credit, claiming that she can buy to-day from some European nations with as little as 10 per cent. in cash and other payments spread over as long as 15 years. A recent agreement with Germany, with orders for \$75,000,000 machinery, provides a credit extension up to 29 months, the German Government guaranteeing 70 per cent. of the amount involved. An agreement with Italy, with orders for \$20,000,000 machinery, provides credit up to 54 months, with similar guarantee by the Italian Government, and both Great Britain and Poland have made recent credit terms with the Russians considered "most favorable" by the Soviets.

All private banks in Russia were taken over by the Bolsheviks or "nationalized" in December, 1917, and on January 18th, 1918, Soviet Russia coolly proceeded to arbitrarily annul all Russian Government obligations of the past. They canceled all their foreign indebtedness and repudiated their obligations to all foreigners, collective or individual. What Soviet immorality in the realm of economics and finance has done once, it can do twice; and the Soviet dictatorship, at war with all so-called capitalistic States (which means all countries outside of Russia), would never hesitate in adopting any policy or in performing any act which it is felt, by them, would be to the selfish advantage of Russia. The Soviets will pay their bills when it is to their advantage to do so and will arbi-

trarily cancel their indebtedness and repudiate their obligations when they feel that they will benefit thereby—and this without any regard whatsoever to the laws of nations, to any existing ethical code, or to any national, group, or individual suffering which would result from their selfish, immoral acts. Yet there are American business executives who, remembering the Russian repudiation of January 18th, 1918, are willing to put their companies' stockholders in the clutches of the Russian bear.

What is the Russian Five-Year Plan? We foreigners hear much of it, as far as its national economic self-sufficiency and its production phases are concerned, but in Russia one hears more of its military ambitions and aspects. Russia must be prepared, not only to stand a siege, but successfully attack "capitalistic" nations. The official *Pravda*, issue of August 29th, 1929, says: "The Five-Year Plan is an important part of the offensive of Sovietism against Capitalism; it is a plan tending to undermine capital stabilization; it is a great plan of world revolution."

There is no material distinction between the policies of the Union of Soviet Russia and the direction of the Third International; the Communist Party of the Soviet Union controls both, and the fundamental policy of this party is the promotion of a world revolution. The Constitution of the U.S.S.R. (the Russian Government of to-day) makes it perfectly clear that the destruction of existing governments outside of Russia is the objective. Monarchies and Republics, autocratic, aristocratic, or democratic governments—every country but Russia—are deemed and contemptuously

branded as "capitalistic"; yet these despised nations generally give the peasant a vote, and no dictatorship, or any form of government in the world to-day outside of Russia, is as arbitrary, as unscrupulous and as enslaving of its labor, its peasants and its humble citizens in general as is Russia.

The Russian Bolshevik, or "terrorist" proletarian, dictatorship has called itself Socialistic and Communistic; they also termed themselves "Social Democrats," and they complete the range by affirming that Russia to-day is a Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics—the U.S.S.R. A republic, however, is a representative democracy, i.e., a state in which sovereignty resides in the people, and the administration is lodged in officers popularly and freely elected by and representing the people. How a party consisting of 1.2 per cent. of the population, refusing by force to permit the existence of any other party and guaranteeing to place all power of government in the hands of a dictator, can, by the wildest stretch of imagination, call itself a Union of Republics is an enigma, impossible of explanation. It is evident that words and names mean nothing to the Russian "Reds" in power.

The Russian Soviet Union embraces the largest single territory in the world. It has natural resources and riches beyond compare; nearly every known mineral, the mining of which is only beginning; forests, it is said, "so vast that cutting one-fourth of the annual growth will disturb the world's lumber market," and millions of square miles still stranger to the plow. Last year one-fifth of the entire cultivated acreage of the world was under Soviet rule.

Why is it that so many American business men and corporations are so stupid, short-sighted and selfish? They think of to-day and ignore to-morrow. They work for an order to-day even though the order carries with it disaster and economic death in the future. They fight against a protective tariff for American industry in general to-day because they booked some volume of export orders during and since the war; they fear what they term "artificial barriers" being raised against them in "reprisal," and they both want and hope to continue all the export business which they have temporarily enjoyed because of peculiar war and post-war conditions, American mass production of world-moving innovations, etc. How ignorant and blind! Not a single country in the world will give America an order for machinery, factory products, farm products, or any other commodities if they can produce what they need themselves and, by so doing, contribute to their national prosperity.

America has a tariff fence; it is not a high one, and it is full of holes; it is not a wall; it is certainly not a barrier. Our tariff is not scientific and has a great many faults—in some items the rates may be too high; in others too low,—but the extent and height of the so-called tariff wall have been grossly exaggerated by demagogues, political opportunists, pseudoeconomists, loud-talking and non-producing intelligentsia, and by selfishly-minded producers and merchants, and its defamers have made no honest attempt to diligently and unbiasedly search for truth and justice and fairly-mindedly compare our tariff schedules and policy with the schedules, barriers, embargoes and prompt-

working, efficient defensive measures that are almost universally in effect elsewhere.

We talk for months and years, drafting and haggling over a political tariff bill—upsetting both our own country and the world. In other countries they talk but little, but they act promptly and that without gloves, and do all the protecting that conditions demand and national well-being suggests.

France condemns the United States Tariff, but no foreign country can ship into France any quantity of goods that France can make or can educate herself to make. France believes in French industry to supply the wants of the French; the result is national prosperity and no unemployment. The French Government is so protective of French industry and agriculture, of French business and interests, and of all French initiative that makes for French prosperity that it has been necessary during recent years for France to import foreign labor into the country, as the demand for workers in France was in excess of the available national supply. Italy, for several years, and, more recently, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Roumania (France's political mid-continental allies, which, with her, form a chain of states around Germany and Austria) have supplied the deficit of France's domestic labor to contribute to France's national greatness. A few years ago France made earnest pleas to the United States for "sympathetic consideration" with respect to her indebtedness to us. Her presentations were undoubtedly weighed by our Washington officials with some degree of business judgment and her claims were apparently accepted as genuine and sincere; the outcome was that

France's obligations were scaled down, in April, 1926, some 40 per cent. "because of her grave economic difficulties," yet France to-day stands forth preeminently as the most prosperous of all nations on many counts and is in many respects the richest country per capita in the world.

Italy severely criticizes the American Protective Tariff, but only because the United States is becoming sufficiently wise and experienced to copy the foreigners' tactics to a degree and think a little bit of, and give a little priority to, domestic labor and invested capital. Our United States motor-car industry, which has benefited so greatly by mass production and the big demand during recent years for a new form of pleasure and business conveyance, has been able to build cars cheaply in quantity and sell cars abroad. This condition, as regards foreign sales, is only temporary and transitional. Gradually, but surely, each progressive foreign country will make its own cars and, as the output of foreign factories increases, up goes the tariff in that country to keep out importations. Our motor-car industry has denounced the new United States Tariff Bill as a whole, as it is feared that threatened reprisals would cut down American car importations to foreign lands. How ridiculous! The leading industrial countries will stop the entry of American cars just as soon as they can make their own; but the world is large, with many "backward" countries with large populations, and, as the world advances, new markets appear and small markets grow to be large ones, taking the place of the old demand of those countries that have grown to be independent of foreign importations. Two years ago Italy pub-

licly posted in its towns, with emphatic ignominy, a list of those "disloyal" subjects who had had the effrontery and had been so un-Italian as to purchase a foreign motor-car, and the Italian tariff on cars, like the import duty on cars in all other countries, has been steadily increasing as the domestic output of cars has approached nearer and nearer to the domestic demand.

Tariff barriers to foreign countries have been increasing for years, and Australia has gone "the whole hog" with its home-labor defensive policy of absolute prohibition applied to imports. If one doubts the existence of tariff barriers abroad, it is only necessary to try to ship a case of matches into any foreign country. In the majority of cases, not only insurmountable import duties, but absolute arbitrary embargoes, with entry positively forbidden, would be encountered, and to endeavor to take a few boxes of matches over almost any foreign frontier brands one—business man or tourist—as criminal.

Before the war certain natural resources and products of the land flowed from European and Asiatic Russia and contiguous States westward to countries in Europe that, in turn, exported manufactured goods to Russia and the East. Later the defection of Russia threw Europe, for a decade following the war, to a great degree upon the economic mercy of the United States. Europe bought from many States overseas (giving preference to her colonies and controlled, or allied, domains) the commodities that she once obtained from Russia, but the United States, one of the principal, unquestioned and reliable sources of available supply in

quantity, got a large part of this business. However, being herself an industrial nation—with tremendous producing power artificially extended because of the war,—the United States accepted all the export business offered, but endeavored to discourage the importation of manufactured goods from Europe in return, and logically gave preference, in her necessary and desirable importations, to tropical raw materials from the foreign possessions of European countries that placed export orders with her. The position held by the United States as an exporting nation during both the war and post-war periods has been naturally void of the germ of permanence. Russia, a great power to be reckoned with, because of its area, natural resources, population and future possibilities, is now determined not only to be self-supporting and independent of all other countries, but to resume her position as a great exporting nation—primarily of her vast natural and land-growing resources. Other countries are in the same position as the United States, with vastly-extended producing facilities and power which they greatly dislike to curtail. The result is greatly increased international competition, with each country being disappointed in both the volume of export business and the unit prices obtained.

There were big increases in European tariffs generally, following the war. Countries that could not possibly feed themselves continued the war policy of attempting to force themselves—to an absurd and uneconomic degree—to be self-supporting, and therefore placed heavy import duties on foodstuffs. Every European nation and most

countries of the world greatly increased their tariff rates, reduced their duty-free commodities, and substantially revised their tariffs upward on both industrial and agricultural products during the decade following the signing of the Armistice.

The future of American industry, as far as market is concerned, lies almost solely in the United States, and to a very large degree the same truth applies to our agricultural products. The war and post-war periods, with their emergency, temporary, or transitional demands for American-manufactured and farm products, has deceived United States industrialists, agriculturists, financiers, business men and legislators. Factories and manufacturing facilities that cannot possibly be steadily used in an economic sense (considering markets and the immutable law of supply and demand) have been built. Acreage has been cleared, developed and cultivated, whose ground, tree and vine crops we cannot market. High and artificial figures of production and sale have been adopted as a national standard "quota" of business volume that cannot possibly be realized unless we undersell the world; and we cannot do that without lowering our standard of living and our wage-scale below that of the foreign lands with whom we desire to successfully compete. Even then foreign countries, themselves capable of producing, would not accept our goods to the detriment of their own labor, their invested capital and their national prosperity.

America, to be economically sound, lastingly prosperous and maintain its unprecedented, high plane of living, must be self-supporting; satisfied almost entirely with its own domestic market; suf-

ficient unto itself; virtually detached and separate, and to a great degree isolated. In this great measure of independence and benevolent self-sufficiency, with resultant relative dissociation, are to be found safety, prosperity, happiness, culture and progress.

Tariffs, by their very nature, will always be not only controversial, but contentious—a source of discord leading inevitably to combativeness and conflict. Free trade is the great “ideal” in foreign business relations; as much desired by all sociologists, philosophers, academic-economists, and even clear-thinking and plain-speaking business men, as it is, unfortunately, impractical and impossible of realization in this generation and century. Free trade would be the greatest step ever taken toward reduction of armaments, universal peace and lasting international good-will. To be made effective, however, all nations would have to adopt it and eliminate all tariffs of every kind and nature; but, what is infinitely harder, all nations would simultaneously have to adopt a uniform plane of living and of compensation of labor. The United States would not be willing to go backward and lose what it has gained in its industrial progress and cultural development, in its earned comforts of life, and in its attainments of physical and mental pleasures and even of luxuries. This means that if we are to enjoy the benefit of free trade, then all the nations of the world must raise the plane of living of their labor to the established United States standard. All labor of the earth must be as free, as responsible, and as well educated as our American labor; their families must have the same pleasures, com-

forts and opportunities; their habits must be generally the same as far as living expenses are concerned. When a Russian Soviet laboring serf, a Chinese or Oriental coolie, a low-caste laborer in Hindustan owns his own home, equipped with comforts, pleasures and work-reducing appliances, when he eats three square meals a day of nutritious food, enjoys recreations and cultural pursuits, and travels to his work in his own automobile, then and not till then can the greatly-to-be-desired ideal of absolute free trade become a feasible and practical working reality.

Much of what is said adversely in regard to our tariff and protective policy is mere twaddle. Instead of locking and barricading our door to importations, we have erected a partial obstruction, or a wall with big holes in it, through which enter more than two-thirds of all our imports, duty free. Only one nation in the world, and that is England—a supposedly free-trade country, with a terrific horde of unemployed and dole recipients,—has a higher percentage. Our figure of over 67 per cent., or two-thirds, of our importations entering the United States duty free is comparable with an average of only 35 per cent., or slightly more than one-third, for the leading nations of Continental Europe.

England, the "prize exhibit" of free-trade adherents, is now advocating a protective tariff for her industries to reduce unemployment and the dole. But "free trade" England has many prohibitive tariff items, and in 1921 she adopted the "Safeguarding of Industries" Act, which imposed a 33-1/3 per cent. duty on foreign imported products competing with her "key," or nationally important,

industries. Italy made a great advance, also, in her tariff duties in 1921, but Britain, which is supposed to be extremely moderate in tariff, actually exacts a higher duty to-day on non-British sugar than we do on Cuban sugar. Moreover, while criticizing our high sugar duty, said by many friends and all our trade enemies to be "extreme and unconscionable," it is well to bear in mind that eight Continental European countries have higher sugar duties than the United States, and the Italian duty is five times that of our much-maligned country.

In regard to the advance in some of our tariff rates last year, it should be borne in mind that, prior to the passage of our existing law, 44 major tariff alterations were made by as many countries during a period of four years—all trending substantially upward,—and since that time some 25 of the commercially prominent foreign countries have made additional adjustments which generally operate as further substantial advances in their protective tariff rates, very few, if any, of which can be branded as "anti-American reprisals," for practically all are intended to promote home industry, afford employment to idle labor and lessen domestic economic depression; therefore all such changes made, being intended to operate for definite and selfish national benefit, are, to a corresponding extent, substantially "anti-foreign."

It is academic to say that as a nation "we cannot expect to do all the selling and no buying." It is quite proper to say that "if we want our foreign trade to prosper we have to make it easy for people to trade with us," but this does not mean that a balance of trade (imports and exports) is necessary

between any two nations. The United States buys from two to ten times as much from some nations as we sell to them, and Dr. Klein aptly says, "The simple reason is, that we need their products just that much more than they need ours; this is the irrefutable answer to the absurd fantasy that foreigners can buy only from those who buy from them. No one does that, either as an individual or a nation, and any attempt to force commerce of that type becomes abnormal and, therefore, precarious. We buy from those who buy from us if there is a bona fide merit in such transaction; lacking that, we, in many cases, buy from those who in turn buy from our customers."

We must certainly expect to get into controversial and turbulent waters when we say how much export business and how much foreign trade are necessary for our national prosperity. Our export business has never been relatively great and probably never will, nor can, be—unless we lower our plane of living or other countries greatly advance theirs. We, as a nation, have been consuming some ninety per cent. of our product. The prime basis of our prosperity has been, and will be, more and more our home market—not foreign markets,—and it is ridiculous for our generally accepted authoritative leaders to say that it is "vital to our prosperity to find a market overseas for ten per cent. of our production." Why 10. per cent.? Why not arbitrarily say 5 or 25 per cent.?

Our motor-car manufacturers, because they have been pioneers in the mass production of an innovation, lead the world in low cost. They have recently enjoyed an export business; they want to keep this

foreign business; they selfishly feel that their chances of holding it will be improved if America has practically no tariff, and, moreover, their cost of production will be lowered if they can buy all the materials and products that go into the making of a car at the lower prices that would result if the United States were virtually a free-trade country. How silly! They ignore the fact that the American worker is a measure and the index of national prosperity. The American worker in buying a motor-car has been the prime reason for the building up of our automobile industry to an unprecedented extent. If our tariff "wall" were demolished to please the leaders of the motor-car industry, foreign labor, who do not use cars, would supplant, in filling our natural demand, the American workmen, who have been the most important buyers of cars and who own cars to-day, but who would have to dispose of their cars when and if they are thrown out of employment.

The American wage-earner and his family are the great consumers of our nation's products of factory, field, forest and mine. As less than 6 per cent. of the country's manufactured goods are exported, it is evident (contrary to the statements being made by agitators for low tariff, debt cancellations, etc.) that American labor is the great, as well as the essential, buyer—in an economic sense—of American-made goods; that the buying power of Americans themselves—dependent to a great degree on the national wage-scale and national plane of living—naturally creates the demand for, and makes some 94 per cent. of, the total market for American-made goods; that the 6 per cent. of such

manufactured articles that are exported is not only a relatively small part of the whole, but the amount that it may or may not be reduced (or even the entire 6 per cent.) is not essential to, or even of prime importance as a factor contributing to, American national prosperity.

According to figures appearing in the press, and generally accepted as being approximately correct, there are some forty-six million persons in the United States who work and "play"; there are some forty millions now employed in gainful occupation, and of the six millions not working about one-third never work, which means that about four million persons are unemployed who want and need jobs. Some eighty to ninety per cent. of the forty million workers now employed are being paid fully as much as, or more than, they received for their labor three or four years ago, and the purchasing power of the wages received by these workers has advanced some twenty per cent. Thrift within bounds is undoubtedly a great virtue, but to-day much that would pass as thrift seems to have become of most doubtful social and economic value. The buying power of the wages now paid some forty million workers in jobs is in relation to that paid forty-four million workers some few years ago as 46.8 is to 44. Therefore if the old wage-scale in the United States is maintained, and if the wage-earners now employed in this country would make purchases and put their wages into circulation, it would be only a comparatively short time before the four millions unemployed, who want jobs, would be put back to work. This happy condition could soon be followed by stabilization of markets and of prices

at a proper level, the end of unprofitable merchandising, the resumption of reasonable dividend disbursements, a return of income-tax payments to normal and general national prosperity.

A correspondent in Europe, commenting recently upon the Continental attitude to Russian dumping, said, "There are always to be found capitalists whose profits from Soviet trade make them active in counteracting the efforts of their injured countrymen to defend themselves." It would seem that business selfishness is not restricted to the United States; here, however, we find it in a great measure camouflaged by a claimed idealism, but always essentially ignorant and fundamentally unpatriotic, not only with respect to Russian dumping, but also aimed at some sections of our tariff law that would give a business or some interest an economic advantage, from which large numbers of our citizens and our labor—who desire the great boon of work at a living wage and the elimination of both unemployment and charity—would inevitably suffer in reaction.

Who can say what our dollar volume of imports and exports should be or what the trade balance in our favor must be—as a minimum? Certain imports that do not conflict with American labor and American prosperity are desirable and of benefit to the country at large—and such imports run, in the aggregate, into a surprisingly large volume. Certain factory or land products of the United States may be in demand in, and will therefore be exported to, certain countries abroad. Progressive manufacturers, both American and foreign, who place inventions and desirable innovations on the market

may be expected, for a time, to enjoy some export business, but to hold a patent on a new article in most foreign countries is conditional upon the article being manufactured in that country. American artisans, together with American inventions and ingenuity, can produce many high-class articles made abroad and of quality equal or superior to that of the foreigner. It is about time for Americans to recognize the quality of American labor and of American products, and repudiate the domestic-made inferiority complex and the notion that the word "imported" denotes superiority. In most cases the direct opposite is true. In most foreign countries, imports sell at a lower figure than home products and are sneered at as "foreign competitive goods." There is a tremendous psychological difference between the use of the word "imported" in the United States and the statement "made in Germany," for instance, marked on goods in the British market.

As some countries are primarily industrial and some agricultural, some in the tropical and some in the temperate or frigid zones, there will always be a substantial measure of foreign trade between nations, for a country logically desires to sell some of her product of which she has an unusable abundance, and has a natural appetency for what she lacks in natural resources and for what she cannot herself produce.

The payment of war debts to the United States has been given undue prominence in relation to our tariff and foreign trade. Ability to pay is far more elastic than exporters, importers and some of our bankers would have us believe. Russia repudiated

all her war debts, and yet we are told that we should trade with her and permit her to contract more debts with us—to be repudiated later if she feels so inclined. England, our most businesslike debtor, never dreamed of paying her large war debt to us, now standing at some four and a half billion dollars, out of a trade balance favorable to us of over half a billion dollars per year and by shipping manufactured goods here which would give employment to British labor, with a corresponding unemployment to American labor.

The three great debtor nations to the United States are Britain, France and Italy, followed by Belgium, Russia and Poland—each of the last three being about 10 per cent. of each of the first three in the order named. Our exports, in aggregate value, (1929) went to Canada (\$948,500,000), Britain (\$848,000,000), Germany (\$410,300,000), France (\$265,600,000), etc. Our imports came primarily from Canada (\$504,300,000), Japan (\$431,900,000), Britain (\$329,800,000), Germany (\$254,700,000), etc. The trade balances most favorable to us in 1929 were with Britain (\$519,000,000), Canada (\$444,000,000), Germany (\$156,000,000), Australia (\$119,000,000), and most unfavorable to us were with Malaya (Brit.) (\$225,000,000), Japan (\$172,000,000), Brazil (\$99,000,000) and India (\$94,000,000), in the order named. The annual trade balance (1929), favorable to the United States, of our three great debtor nations stood at some 11 per cent. of their total indebtedness to us in the case of Great Britain (excluding all British colonies and possessions); about 2.3 per cent. for France and about

1.8 per cent. for Italy. The imports into the United States (1929) from Great Britain (excluding colonies and possessions) had a value about twice that required by the annual debt payment; France about 3.3 times and Italy 9 times.

Our European Allies in the Great War have very adroitly transferred to Germany the burden of their debt to the United States. Britain counts on the amounts she receives from Germany, France and Italy to balance her war-debt payments to the United States, and France and Italy are also paying their war debts to us and to Britain out of the proceeds of German reparations. France, in addition, is drawing from the same source more than \$100,000,000 per year, which represents the excess of what she gets from Germany over what she pays out as war debts to the United States and Britain.

Our principal European debtors are persistent in their statements that Germany is actually the only country paying, or that should pay, their war debts to us, and they endeavor to transfer to our shoulders all the difficulties of, and all the responsibility for, the continuation and collection of German payments. The United States loaned money to Britain, France, Italy and other countries, but neither loaned money to Germany and her allies, nor has directly collected or demanded reparations from them. The United States, moreover, did not guarantee the credit of France, Italy and other countries to Britain when these allies of Britain borrowed money from her. The European situation is European; the American situation is American, and our coalescent and world-leadership policy under Wilson has brought us much trouble and cost us

much money, to say nothing of lives and the many foreign, irritating hatreds that weary us to-day.

We are told that the United States is directly responsible for the well-being of Germany and for her position as a responsible nation in a Congress of European nations. This we should energetically deny. France, Britain and Italy have much more interest in what Germany does than has the United States. Britain believes that there is a grave danger of political disturbances in Germany which might be followed by either a Soviet or Hitler, so-called Fascist, régime, under which there would be a complete cessation of reparation payments instead of merely a decrease in their annual amount. France and Italy are not so panicky about internal conditions in Germany, or so pessimistic about the Teuton ability to pay; moreover, France constantly keeps in mind the amount which she is receiving from Germany over and above what she pays out in the liquidation of her national indebtedness.

All the nations that owe the United States war debts, however, endeavor to tie these debts to German reparations, and Britain persistently preaches that the entire issue, in the last analysis, is "the importance to the United States of the recovery of Germany, not merely economically, but politically and morally." Britain, and other European nations to a lesser degree, seeks not only to make us a brother to Germany, but this brother's keeper. The harm that any revolution in Germany can do outside of Germany is, to a great degree, dependent upon the geographic proximity of other countries to Germany, if we eliminate international loans, which should affect interests and individuals

rather than nations, and reparations, which affect nations that are in debt to us, but not the United States directly or primarily.

America is urging all nations to disarm, reduce their militarism and free themselves of the economic drain of competitive armaments. Britain is in full accord with our attitude and program, but not so France or Italy. Germany, however, which supposedly has a very limited and restricted army and navy and is in a seemingly unfortunate economic condition, with large unemployment, threatens to build her armaments up to France (which has an army of 400,000 men in Europe) and, "with Soviet aid, achieve military parity with France." Can an impoverished nation find the tremendous sums of money needed for an aggressive campaign in competitive armaments? To be relieved of war-reparation payments would, of course, materially assist Germany toward the realization of the ambition of certain junker-nationalist elements in Germany, which it is hoped are not in the majority, and, as a minority, will not succeed in usurping power and dictatorship through force.

Dr. Klein, commenting on the statement freely made by prejudiced interests to their ignorant, sheep- and parrot-like followers that our tariff, being an obstruction to European imports, impairs the war-debt-paying capacity of these European nations, says, "The absurdity of that contention can be disposed of in a few words. The payment on this account of our four leading European debtors last year was about \$228,000,000. To counter-balance that, in these four countries our importers and tourists bought goods and services slightly in

excess of \$700,000,000. Only about a quarter of these purchases were affected in any way by our tariff, so there was available for settlement of these balances, entirely free and unhampered by any tariff obstacles, a group of values more than double the amount of the war-debt payment."

Importers who howl so much at our tariff are generally mere business firms who employ no American productive labor, have practically no invested capital and contribute but little, if any, through taxes, to the expense of running our municipal, State and Federal governments. Moreover, their talk of the shrinkage of our volume of export business being due entirely to the tariff is preposterous. Whereas the incoming European wares subject to duty fell off 33 per cent. for the first quarter of the current year as compared with the first quarter of the preceding year, the reduction of imports from the same countries coming in free of all duties was 41 per cent. All such lessening in volume, it is clearly evident, is primarily due to business depression and to a temporary shrinkage in our buying power.

The country and the world in general are suffering from business depression; foreign trade has lapsed seriously, but so has domestic trade. Joseph S. Lawrence rightly says that "politicians are not noted for a critical examination of the economic issues which they seek to exploit for party purposes," and that "such matters should be looked into from a non-political point of view." He then definitely states, with figures to substantiate his conclusions, that "the foreign trade of the United States has suffered no more, on the average, than has the trade

of nineteen other leading commercial nations." America, during the present depression—notwithstanding the tariff—maintains approximately 20 per cent. of "the aggregate imports and exports of the world's leading trading group." If the United States Tariff were a real factor in reducing our foreign trade, as claimed, there should be some substantial and clearly evident difference "in the rate of decline suffered by egregious offenders," such as the United States is presumed to be, as compared with the average of other countries which, it is claimed, do not have "iniquitous import abuses." As a matter of fact, "Free Trade" Britain has suffered in foreign trade as much as the United States, and the British diagnosis of distress does not blame tariff for their economic troubles, but insinuates that the lack of high tariff may be responsible. Instead of regarding free trade as the formula for salvation, Britain is rapidly coming to the conclusion that the abandonment of her century-old policy of unrestricted trade is necessary for her economic survival and that substantial tariff defenses are essential for her prosperity. Domestic trade in the United States has dropped during this period of depression about as much as our foreign trade; this is proved by a 30 per cent. drop in car loadings and a 33 per cent. drop in foreign trade during the same period. Lawrence, of the Board of Industrial Counselors, says, "It is doubtful if a revision of our tariff structure in either direction will have any material effect upon our foreign trade. The slump in external commerce is a natural and essential incident of world-wide depression, and has always occurred, no matter what the particular alignment of interna-

tional trade relationships and tariffs has been."

One of the prime causes of the continuation of our business depression is the steady growth of profitless merchandising. If wages are held up, prices should also hold up, and this would permit our corporations and business in general to pay reasonable dividends on the capital invested, make desirable improvements, with an associated further employment of labor, pay income taxes, and thus avoid or materially reduce a Federal deficit. Profitless merchandising is an unfair and demoralizing trade practice that is the vicious result of our laws, which are suspicious of co-operation and deify competition. Declining prices discourage buying, paralyze business and throw workers out of employment. Profitless merchandising must inevitably, in the end, lead, not only to business failures, but to drastic wage reductions and to an increase in taxation to cover deficits in Federal income, which will make the vicious circle complete.

Prosperity does not come from low prices, but from fair profits and good wages. Business losses inevitably tend to depress wages, lower the plane of living and lead to the inability of both corporations and individuals to pay taxes to carry the financial load of government. It should be considered not only inadvisable and poor policy, but decidedly unethical (and illegal) for any corporation to sell its product below the gross cost of production; just as much as to sell its goods at "hold-up" and unwarranted, high levels. A country's laws should operate to encourage prosperity. Laws and procedure that operate to destroy fair profits and good wages are decidedly un-American in spirit.

Our factories and our farms should produce just as much as domestic consumption and, in some lines, reasonable export business suggest; this and no more. Overproduction is as senseless and depraved as profitless merchandising, and one generally leads to the other. Estimates of export business should be intelligently based on the volume demand and on a knowledge of the costs, prices and extent of foreign competition. If the wage-scale of American workers is held and the plane of living raised rather than lowered, the domestic demand for goods will hold or be increased per capita, and with co-operative sanity, encouraged by the Government, our country could again become prosperous after arresting the present accelerating trend of disastrous retrogression.

The United States policy with respect to foreign export trade should be to obtain every bit of such trade that can be obtained along sound, economic lines in competition with the world and without handicapping or penalizing our home trade and domestic producers in general; there should be no voluntary retirement from any field abroad, where business is procurable for our factories, mines, forests and farms; and we certainly are under no obligation to philanthropically or altruistically voluntarily turn profitable and desirable markets over to persuasive and claimedly "hard-pressed" rivals. Our charity as a nation should commence at home, to the advantage of our own citizens. With respect to importations, we need all those commodities, raw materials and food products that we cannot produce within our own domain, and all those world-advancing, better things that the lead-

ing brains abroad are able to produce. We also need contacts and mental interplay with all peoples so that we may stimulate each other and encourage the creation and distribution of both ideas and material things, and this for the good of the world and the economic, material and spiritual benefit of humanity in general.

Our national trade balance will be determined in the ultimate, scientifically and sanely, after our politicians, pseudoeconomists and selfish industrialists and agriculturalists have, unfortunately, caused great distress throughout the land because of their ignorance and what, in the last analysis, must be branded as a destructive and demoralizing procedure, with its essentially stupid and immoral propaganda.

When considering the broad subject of national well-being, it is well not to pay too much attention to the statements of so-called experts, whose interests are restricted and who are analysts of a part, and that usually "a little," rather than of the whole. Lord Salisbury once remarked, "If you believe a doctor, nothing is wholesome; if you believe a theologian, nothing is innocent; if you believe a soldier, nothing is safe." A specialist, or any man of narrow interest or astigmatic vision, is a poor general executive and a poor Moses to lead a weary and restive people out of Egypt.

In the realm of politics we are cursed with party basic "principles" which, being primarily "differences," mentally dwarf and circumscribe the reasoning power, vision and usefulness of our legislators. To a Democrat, everything Republican is wrong; and to a Republican, everything that

emanates from or depicts the principles (or lack of them) of a Democrat is "of the devil." Our legislators line up "for" or "against" the Government on orthodox and usually senseless party lines, absolutely without regard to individual conviction and with no honest consideration of fact. A Protestant cannot stomach a Roman Catholic, and a Catholic has an all-permeating hatred of, or contempt for, a Protestant. To some normally decent people, "free trade" or "the tariff" is like a red rag to a bull; to many, "100 per cent. Americanism" seems like a declaration of religious faith and not the stupid, bigoted Ku Klux Klanism—absolutely non-American in fact—that ignorant fanatics have tried to make of it. Prohibition and the gangster era rob us of both self- and collective-respect. Old-fashioned graft is to-day backed up by machine guns and by organized viciousness carried to the *n*th power.

The anarchy of nationalism as exemplified in the World War is being practised to-day at our own doors, and we naturally do not like it. We advocate "law and order" and still prate of liberty and democracy. Why do we not consistently practise what we preach? We are slaves to-day, boasting of a freedom that we do not possess, an honor that we have lost, and a religion that we are too senseless and stupid to understand and too narrow, prejudiced and selfish to enjoy. We refuse to think and act as individuals. We pay ministers to preach to us, newspaper men to write for us, and opportunist and prejudiced "party" representatives and senators (State and Federal) to vote and legislate for us. The result is an inferior automa-

ton existence; the atrophy of our minds and souls; a flux of senseless laws; an era of "reform" that is enslaving in fact, and in reality emanates from the devil; our reading is primarily that of an authoritative, but private-owned, selfish, power-seeking and money-making press that gloats in our vacuity and is essentially sensational and crudely scandal-mongering; that preaches "the freedom of the press" in a superior, convincing way, but practically interprets this "freedom" as license—with the privilege of ruthlessly invading an individual's privacy; that boasts of its "art" in telling the truth and, in doing so, definitely emphasizes untruths; that glories in our stupidity; that feeds our passions, our prejudices, our innate hankering after sensationalism and our indwelling iconoclasm; that encourages, supports and develops everything other than our humanity and our reason.

Because of the present prolonged period of depression we are being told by ignorant and cowardly souls, who are influenced by insidious propaganda emanating originally from Soviet Russia, the Third International and their "friends," that our democratic system of government, with its associated "capitalistic" or "private property" economic system, has been tried and has dismally failed. The same criticism and the same general statements are being made in all European countries that are suffering with unemployment, but they are not being made in France, the most "democratic and capitalistic" of any nation on earth. France protects her national industries and the employment of her labor in a prompt, effective and paternal way by tariffs and embargoes, and supervises, as well as re-

stricts, all foreign-trade activities in France that detrimentally tend to affect French labor, French capital and French prosperity; the result is that, notwithstanding European and American economic woes, France stands forth preeminently prosperous and flourishing, with all her workers employed and, in addition, some 1,500,000 alien laborers (which she has imported to add to her prosperity as an industrial and agricultural nation working under governmental protection—that is economic, not political nor emotional), all of whom she would repatriate if it became necessary to do so in order to keep native Frenchmen from suffering from unemployment. Democracy in government and “capitalism,” or the principle of private property as an economic system, with the whole permeated by the principle of individual liberty and self-government, has not failed in France and will not fail in any enlightened country if it is given an honest chance. When Beecher was told that Christianity had failed, he replied, “What nonsense; it has not even been tried.” Calvin Coolidge aptly says that the same retort is applicable to the current emotional criticism of our American system—it also has not been tried. To change the underlying principles and the essentials of our American political and economic system would be “to restrict the freedom of the individual, let some one else govern him, give the reward of his industry to others and make him support others”; all of which means the enslaving of the individual and a refusal to give a man the fruits of his labor. Our system of democracy, individual liberty and private property is fundamentally sound in principle, but all the many evi-

dent shortcomings, weaknesses and injustices, resulting in a seemingly partial failure, are due to ignorance, selfishness and human imperfections.

What we need is to get back to the republic of our fathers and the essential principles of pure and unadulterated democracy. Under Wilson, socialism masqueraded as democracy, and to-day a so-called "Progressive" is apt to be as antagonistic to progress, justice, liberty and truth as he is to narrow party orthodoxy. A citizen of the United States is rightly deprived of liberty by the unanimous vote of twelve of his peers; every citizen of our country is, to a degree, being deprived of liberty, of rights of property, of the fruits of his labor and, at times, of human justice by laws that defy and repudiate in operation the underlying and all-permeating spirit of our Constitution, and this by a Supreme Court vote of probably 5 to 4—with all the judges politically appointed; though the personnel of this court changes from time to time and the complexion of their decisions varies with the mental make-up and prejudices of its members, the court, as a body, never reverses itself, but in the interpretation of law, in certain phases affecting human liberty, coupled with the court's deification of precedents, continues to pyramid its error as a monument to infallibility—of a small numerical majority. Our Supreme Court, with its 5 to 4 decisions on vital questions, has degenerated during the last few decades to a super-legislative and semi-political body; all laws that are based on such 5 to 4 decisions are either fundamentally bad for a democracy, such as we pretend to be, or at least decidedly questionable.

When will Congress perform the duty commanded by our national Constitution, which says that Representatives shall be apportioned among the States according to their respective populations and further stipulates that the number of Representatives for each State shall be reapportioned each ten years immediately following the determination of the population of each State and of the entire country by national census? There are people in the United States being deprived, while Congress plays politics, of a voice in government and of that representation which the Constitution guarantees. As there has been no reapportionment of Representatives in our national Congress, based on population, since the census figures of 1910, it is questionable as to whether any law passed during the last ten years is legally sound and not subject to attack on the ground of unconstitutionality in that our House of Representatives has not been (since the 1920 census was taken) a truly representative body. For over a decade a large number of our people have been taxed and governed without representation; this is in violation of the spirit of democracy and of the basic principle of a republican form of government.

The United States of America should be what it was originally intended to be, a homogeneous union of contiguous sovereign States forming one compact, geographical whole in interests and for defense. It is un-American to be imperialistic, to hold and dominate islands of the sea, or to exploit foreign peoples in so-called "possessions." Such foreign-occupied lands should be given up and the territory of the United States, for both develop-

ment and defense, should be limited to that of the compact and contiguous States of the Union. If this were done, our armed forces would exist solely for the defense of our country, and not a single United States citizen (soldier or marine) would ever be landed to fight on a foreign shore. What we need to-day is more of the real spirit of Americanism and less Imperialism—militaristic, economic, "religious" and moral. If freed of foreign possessions and the bugaboo of protecting foreign markets and foreign investments by force, American parents could rear families of children to be useful and productive members of society and not "cannon fodder" when Jingoism, national pride, with its infallibility and superiority complex (and what is wrongly called "patriotic" ballyhoo, originating in ignorance or selfishness and fed by emotionalism), again runs like wild-fire over the country, culminating—if not controlled and suppressed—in death, distress and the crucifixion of all truth, all virtue, all spiritual religion and all real human loyalty and brotherhood.

The three instruments of destruction that, "hand in hand," have led to wars and that continue to threaten the peace of the world are Nationalism, Militarism and Imperialism; they have been termed "the three shibboleths of the century." Nationalism, when sound, sane and human, is worthy and not combative; it is not obtrusive, aggressive, meddlesome, or immoral; but the nationalism that leads to war is that which assumes superiority to and predominance over other peoples, that seeks foreign possessions, foreign domination and, in reality and substance, works, through force and bigotry with

their associated lawlessness, for anarchy in international relations—both political and economic. The exploitation of so-called backward peoples and foreign-trade competition inevitably leads to national friction. It is significant that the great nations of the world, with their possessions, are known as "Powers"; the name truly suggests force, and nations are great or small "Powers" dependent, apparently, on the weight of their armaments and the success that customarily attends their threats and stands on international questions. Nationalism of the perverse, ignorant and bigoted variety demands the weapon of militarism and seeks imperialism; it invariably claims "Divine right," but it is essentially the spirit of Godless anarchy and it leads to war—which is international anarchy. The spirit of the old saying "Nothing succeeds like success" has sanctified the union of nationalism and militarism. A large army is a standing threat, and the possessor inevitably becomes imperialistic and seeks, by force, threats, or bluff, to win as a "Great Power" some desired economic advantage, with enhanced political prestige. There are no admittedly "offensive" wars to-day; every invading army is said to be waging some "preventive" war which is subtly claimed to be some form of "defensive" war; all "force" and the operations of "Powers" are dishonest, as well as brutal. Fanatical nationalism invariably brands other countries as menacing, vengeful, jealous, or decadent; their culture, if any, is deemed decidedly inferior. Such a mental attitude breeds wars and, when armaments are at hand, makes for wars.

War is grossly stupid. The United States was

enticed and fooled into entering the World War as an active combatant overseas, and after we sacrificed our splendid young men, our advantage of aloofness, our prosperity and tens of billions of dollars, we are to-day the nation that is the most hated by the Allies—our one-time brothers-in-arms. We gave much, and that with unselfish enthusiasm, and we have received nothing in return; not even their gratitude, friendly and honest acknowledgment, or good will. Moreover, the countries which we saved by our sacrifice of blood and gold would like to repudiate their money debts to us and follow in the footsteps of Russia. Uncle Sam has become a cruel, grasping and mercenary Uncle Shylock to our one-time European Allies and much-vaunted "friends."

The settlements made by the United States with our debtor nations, following our most expensive participation with them in the war, were most liberal; they were not "fair and equitable," they were generous and permeated with co-operative good will. Our one-time Allies whine about their war debts to us, but, instead of economizing and slashing down their armament expenditures, they have very materially increased their senseless and unwarranted annual outlay to equip them for future wars. A drastic policy of disarmament throughout the world would make for peace and materially contribute to the ability of the debtor nations to pay their already scaled-down debts. The recent Congress held in Washington of the International Chamber of Commerce showed a far more selfish than scientific attitude on the part of the attending business men from foreign lands. All the debtor

nations desired "concessions" to the benefit of themselves and to the detriment of the United States: cancellation of war debts to enrich European nations at the expense of the American taxpayer; lower United States tariff rates to give work to foreign labor, with corresponding unemployment to American workers; increased competition in the American market to lower United States wage-scales and standard of living. While long-headed and progressive Americans are struggling to reduce unemployment, hold up wages and seek "to bring about a higher purchasing power among our own people," our foreign guests advocate a program that has been aptly described as "a gigantic effort to pull America down to the European plane of living and scale of wages." The attack on our tariff is basically an attack on the United States wage-scale.

Many a nation has made war in the past for trade and economic reasons. Imperialism is much more than brass bands, pride and "glory"; it is more often the acquiring by force of natural resources and markets. Nations fight to get foreign trade and to hold foreign trade against rival nations. They also fight, as creditors, to get their bills paid and to "save" their loans. A nation extending credit to another nation at war, furnishing them with supplies in quantity and floating bonds to raise money for them if they have little or no trade with, or financial interest in, their debtor nation's adversary, can be expected—no matter how propaganda and "authority" may justify the act and, with deadened conscience, resort to camouflage and "window-dressing"—to take sides with the nation that has

become their debtor or economic ally, particularly if the war drags along and the military and financial position of the debtor nation begins to look precarious. Foreign trade; foreign credit; foreign loans, desirable and worthy at times and under certain conditions, can nevertheless lead to wars or participation in frightful wars—and most of the men who fight in the war and the people who suffer from the war never know the underlying cause of the war. Moreover, those responsible for foreign-trade credit and loans or the issuing and marketing of foreign bonds in the homeland, etc., etc., are generally powerful enough to control channels for the spread of propaganda and resourceful enough to cleverly use it so that not only Jingoists, but the more brainy and devoted classes of nationalists, and even idealists, fall beneath their sway and, under the influence of unselfish emotionalism, declare for, support and wage war. Trade and money (imperialistic, or protective of their foreign ventures, commitments, extension of credit, etc.) harness the most worthy nationalism and its ideals (which are void of all selfishness and avarice) to wage their inhuman, diabolical and thoroughly unnecessary wars of suffering and destruction.

If the United States (as “whispered” for years and now openly asserted by many students of history) was subtly influenced to enter the World War on the side of the Allies because of the possibility of their military defeat and economic collapse, with the loss to American bankers, bondholders and business of vast sums of money loaned, is it not grossly inconsistent for the same general interests, now that the load, greatly intensified, has been shifted from

a few private interests to the United States Government and now reposes on the shoulders of every United States citizen and taxpayer, to agitate the cancellation of all war debts? A loss affecting a few was considered unthinkable; an infinitely greater money loss affecting the entire country is agitated as not only desirable, but even necessary if we are to be prosperous and hold our foreign trade. If we cancel the indebtedness of nations to us and greatly increase our burden of taxation, these nations may or may not make some purchases from us for a few years, on which we may make a little profit, but, as we would have to compete for all their business with low-cost-producing countries, we would probably make no profit whatsoever—and also get very little volume of business. In other words, for every dollar of debt canceled we may get, over a long term of years, an additional ten cents' worth of business on which, if we are lucky, we may suffer but little loss and possibly break even; but in the meanwhile we have to float new bonds, dollar for dollar, equaling the amount of debts canceled, and pay interest thereon, increasing thereby our national debt, our annual expenses of government and our taxes.

A foreigner, like an American, can be expected to buy where he can find commodities and prices most to his liking. If the United States cancels all her war debts, she is not sure that foreign purchases of her goods will increase one iota over what they now are, or even hold at the present volume. The indebtedness of a European nation to the United States is a government matter. The buying by Europeans of American goods is distinctly and

solely a private matter—a cold-blooded business affair where price, quality and service alone dominate the transaction.

We hear much controversy as to who won the recent Great War. But there is no question that it was America who lost (by) the war. In an intoxication of idealism, we ignorantly and emotionally entered the war to end all wars—although history tells us that most great wars have been heralded and defended, by authorities responsible for them, as such, and the Ancient Greeks ardently declared that one of their great wars was “a war to end all wars” several centuries before the dawn of the Christian Era. Our academic Democrat-President Wilson also asserted that the recent World War was an armed conflict “to make the world safe for democracy.” We entered the war—as idealistic crusaders, with high motives and strong faith—enjoying some measure of human freedom; we emerged disillusioned with much less; gradually, since that time, what was left of our individual liberty—the very essence and vital substance of real democracy—has been and is being taken from us.

A very small minority of our citizens—the so-called “successful few”—in harmony with the existing national policy of socialistic confiscation and “making a very small minority of the voters pay,” are heavily taxed to-day to pay for past wars and to prepare for future wars. Of the total expenditures of our Government 64.6 per cent. covers past and future wars, and during the past year 57.5 per cent. of the Federal revenue was derived from income taxes, with only two per cent. of the country’s population paying any part of such tax,

through individual assessments, and about three-tenths of one per cent. paying 97 per cent. of said individual, discriminatory tax.

What did America gain by the war? Nothing; absolutely nothing but condemnation, outrageous expenditures, malicious vilification and abuse. What did America lose by the war? Eighty thousand dead and two hundred and seventy-five thousand known casualties, taken from our youth—our ablest, strongest, most spirited and most promising. The World War meant sixty million men at arms; twelve million to twenty million (soldiers and civilians) dead—all estimates understate—and an equal amount irreparably physically maimed, to say nothing of mental anguish, economic distress and embittered disillusionment, with atrophy of soul and a lasting social injury beyond any description. measurement and appraisal.

Because of the war, the national debt of the United States increased from \$1,193,047,745 in 1913 to \$26,596,701,684 in 1919, and is now more than sixteen billion dollars. Our Federal annual expense of \$724,500,000 in 1913 rose to over \$18,500,000,000 in the year ending August 31st, 1919, and is now some five billion dollars. Our national debt, after thirteen years of economic struggling to reduce it, is some fifteen times what it was before the World War, and our annual expenses of government have increased about sevenfold. Our national revenue was \$724,111,230 in 1913; it was \$5,152,257,136 in 1919 and \$4,177,941,702 last year—with the greater part coming from taxation. During the World War eight nations admittedly increased their public debts to the extent of one

hundred and thirty billions of dollars, with the "victorious" Allies going into debt twice as much as the "defeated" Central Powers. Moreover, the nations who are said to have won the war collectively mobilized about twice as many men and lost almost twice the number of the Central Powers, who, being ultimately defeated at arms, are said to have lost the war.

The Russian revolution and Red Sovietism is one fruit of the stupid World War. The Russian proletariat suffered abominably; they were outrageously sacrificed by the million through inefficiency and stupidity. No wonder the abused and victimized populace of Russia rebelled at any authority that would lead them into the war, sacrifice them en masse (at times one rifle for four soldiers), and give them no hope or confidence in the future. Germany's rebellion against Prussian junkerism—when her armies were beaten—is less worthy than the hopeless, disgusted attitude of the Russian proletariat that permitted the Bolsheviks, with their fine-sounding proletarian doctrine of an International Brotherhood of Workers, to usurp power and take the reins of government. Kaisers, emperors, czars and kings, with their courts and advisers, were overthrown, not because they were morally wrong, but because they failed in their objectives; such is the viciousness of unprincipled nationalism. Of all the countries who took a major part in the war, the Russian people are the least blameworthy, for they suffered the most, had the least to say, and had the lowest average intelligence—at least as far as use and development are concerned. Now the masses, as stupid as ever, but

sadder and more sullen, have changed masters, but they are greater slaves than ever, for they lack to-day even the suggestion of possible individual freedom, which in the old evil days was at least theoretically possible and at times actually realized.

It is about time that American citizens, American legislators and American business men commenced to consider the United States as a unique country, capable of supporting itself almost entirely as a separate, self-contained, self-sufficient and more or less detached unit. The United States would enjoy, and be generally benefited by, an unprecedented measure of prosperity if it would energetically develop its own resources, confine itself almost exclusively to the development of its own natural market, take up once more the fundamental tenets of democracy, repudiate demagogism, refuse to pull chestnuts out of the fire for anyone—not even for our international bankers, bondholders, or corporations interested in business ventures abroad or engaged in foreign trade—and last, but not least, protect itself and consistently mind its own business in an international sense. Our national policy should be “A square deal for all, human interest in and good will to all mankind, but America for Americans, first, last and all the time.”

This does not mean that the United States should be disinterested in foreign trade or refuse any honest foreign business, but it does suggest the consideration of all foreign business in its proper relation to domestic business and to national prosperity as a whole. Legitimate foreign business is most desirable if it can be obtained without jeopardizing or “knifing” any phase of American

industry and agriculture, the employment and well-being of American labor and our national standard of living, with associated wage-scale, etc. Foreign business, however, that requires trickery, a lowering of national standards, and irregularities to obtain, and warships, armies, unscrupulousness, graft, or questionable strategic loans to protect and hold, is far better left alone. Let imperialistic contenders battle for such markets and such business; the spoils of supposed and claimed "victory" are not worth the price.

Some foreign loans are both worthy and reasonable and, if made to stable and progressive governments, afford good security from an investor's standpoint. However, all such bond issues and all United States investments made in foreign industrial or agricultural enterprises, or in the obtaining and marketing of a foreign country's natural resources, should be the transactions of individuals or of domestic corporations who invest their money and take an associated risk on their own initiative, in accordance with their personal judgment and for their own private gain. Such investors should not expect the United States Government to protect their business ventures or, by force of arms, make good any losses which they may sustain. Americans purchasing foreign bonds or any form of foreign securities, and Americans entering into business abroad, should do so with their eyes open and at their own risk. The United States Government, which means America as a whole, cannot be more interested in foreign than in domestic investments, and it is not customary to use our armed forces, either openly or camouflaged, to recover

“Wall Street” losses, or to use our national funds to reimburse investors who have been unfortunate in the use of their capital in either apparently warranted and legitimate domestic business ventures or in senseless and uneconomic promotions within the confines of the United States.

There must of necessity be a measure of interdependence mingled with our national, political and economic Liberty and Independence. We have no desire to go back to primitive methods and deprive ourselves of giving or receiving benefits of an economic, or any other desirable, nature, but what we should demand is balance, in an economic sense, and an equilibrium, both scientific and progressive, that tends in its operations and manifestations to protect the American nation, the American working man and the American youth—as well as the fathers and mothers of the youth of the nation. Our capitalism should be freedom of individual initiative, the individual right and opportunity to work, the individual right to develop and progress, and the right of private property. Our militarism should be the defense of our country, our homes, our culture and our ideals.

Our country has never had a “closed door” or prohibitive tariff and probably never will have one. Because of this fact, it is evident that our industries and our agricultural interests are vulnerable to dumping and to every form of low-price attack. Knowing this (if they even deign to think of it or look ahead at all), American industrialists are nevertheless selling machines to Soviet Russia and teaching the unprincipled Bolsheviks processes and the art of economic quantity or mass pro-

duction in order that Russia may not only supply its own domestic demands, but export and capture the world's markets—including that of the United States, their own country. This is not only shortsighted; it is traitorous. Judas sold his Lord for thirty pieces of silver; American business men are selling American industry, American labor, American capital, American prestige and America itself to the Russian Soviets for a few paltry dollars. To gain a few thousands or millions of dollars to-day, they not only mortgage the future, but destroy it. They deify the present and ignore the future, crucifying its very spirit of economic hope and innate virtue.

The Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, after spending about six months in making an intensive study of "commercial relations" with Russia and the Soviet economic menace, by an almost unanimous vote has recently adopted the following resolution: "That the importation of commodities produced within the boundaries of the Union of Socialistic Soviet Republics is detrimental to the public interest and should be discontinued; that it deplores the exportation of industrial equipment and the extension of technical advice to the rulers of Russia, which is, in effect, giving aid to elements seeking to destroy the economic and political systems under which we live, and is, therefore, wholly unjustified on political, economic, social and moral grounds."

If America and the European nations had placed an embargo on Russian goods, had refused to either buy from or sell to them and, therefore, had neither permitted dumping in their domains nor extended

credit to the Soviets, and if American and European experts in economic, modern and mass production—both individuals and corporations—had refused to become instructors in the pay of the Soviets, the dictatorship of the Russian people by the unscrupulous Bolshevik leaders would have been materially weakened and its end hastened. America fought in the World War presumably “to make the world safe for democracy.” Our industrial and commercial, i.e., our trade, policy with Russia today is the very antithesis of our stated war aims. We, as Americans, together with practically all of the countries of Europe, by trading with Russia, teaching her modern methods and supplying her with modern machines and equipment, are operating to repudiate the spirit of democracy, wreck democratic institutions and overthrow all governments of, by and for the people.

An official of the Amtorg Trading Corporation—Soviet owned and controlled—has publicly announced that 4,500 foreign engineers and technicians are now at work in various capacities in the Soviet Union, of which some 1,000 are Americans. He further stated that 3,000 more foreign engineers, 3,000 more foremen, and some 7,000 to 8,000 more expert foreign mechanics are needed and will be engaged by Soviet Russia this year to develop Russian resources, build factories, etc., and teach Russian labor modern production methods and how to build and use modern machines. While there is great unemployment in America, Germany, Great Britain and other countries, he also commented on the fact that not only is there no unemployment in Russia, but the demand for Russian

labor is so great (as Russian workers, because of their exports and dumping are throwing Americans, Germans, British, etc., out of their jobs) that there is an actual shortage of labor in Russia of some two million workers, which fact, it is said, "constitutes a serious obstacle to the successful development of the Five-Year Plan." This spokesman for the Soviets further said that foreign engineers and skilled workers going into Russia must not expect "the comforts and ease which are guaranteed by the great cities of America or Western Europe," and they must not expect to get the food, housing, sanitation, amusements, etc., that they have been accustomed to in "capitalistic" countries; however, if they go to Soviet Russia with a willingness to "rough it" and "with an earnest desire to help in the building up of the country," they will be welcomed by the Soviet Government and "conditions made as pleasant for them as possible." The skilled workers, engineers and industrial experts of the world are being bought "with gold" (or the promise of it) to go into Soviet Russia to teach the native, low-priced, or serf, labor to make goods to compete in the foreigners' home market and throw their fellow countrymen out of work. This is analogous to an American citizen in time of war not only enlisting in the army of a foreign foe, but acting for them as an instructor of military tactics and a trainer of armed forces; in the production and use of modern munitions and weapons of war, and in the actual selling for money to his country's enemy of military and kindred knowledge that would definitely brand him as a traitor to his native land and as a potential destroyer of his fellow countrymen.

In essential principles there is no difference between the militaristic and the economic phases of international warfare so far as patriotism, loyalty and honor are concerned.

The Constitution of the United States defines treason as "adhering to one's country's enemies, giving them aid and comfort" and, again, "Treason is betrayal of the people of the United States." Any corporation official or any individual who is, or pretends to be, an American, who either knowingly and deliberately, or through ignorance, lack of vision and incompetency builds up the power of Soviet Russia to the detriment of the United States, is a traitor to his country, is guilty of treason and treachery and, if an official of a corporation, is a betrayer of a trust.

It is not enough to say that a corporation benefits at the moment for an asinine, short-sighted, or disloyal act on the part of its active management; the question of benefit or harm, advantage or disadvantage is determined by time, through the period of years and decades. Any executive who, in order to show earnings in the present, sacrifices the future is not only faulty in judgment, but is iniquitous, both morally and economically. Through ignorance, egoism, or stupidity he is guilty of a breach of faith; what he may deem the immediate good is ultimate harm; what he may picture as beneficial is bad in character and nature.

A loyal executive will fight for his associates, his employers and his employees, his country and his fellows. He will not deliver himself, his company, his fellow workers, or his countrymen over to the enemy. It is unfortunate and deeply re-

grettable that so many American companies to-day are helping the Russians to invade and economically devastate the United States. These men, these executives, these boards of directors are "Benedict Arnolds"—American traitors in the Revolutionary Economic War of the third and fourth decades of the twentieth century. These men thrust their much-advertised "Christian" name of "Benedict" forward, but it is merely a name (even if fifteen popes selected it as their own). Such selfish, time-serving and self-satisfied business "go-getters" may pose as, and be ignorantly acclaimed as, "blessed" to-day; they will be "accursed" to-morrow.

And what do the Russians say of all this American ignorance, stupidity and avarice? They not only laugh at us; they despise us. They repeat, with mirth and scorn, Lenin's prophecy, "The capitalists will sell us the spades with which to bury them." Read what the "New Russia's Primer—The Story of the Five-Year Plan"—by M. Ilin, Russia's official Soviet text-book for school use, says: "We have been forced to buy machines, etc., from abroad and to pay to European and American capitalists large sums of money. This condition is intolerable, but we are working according to a plan, and the success of the plan does not depend on whether a foreigner desires or does not desire to sell us machines. Foreigners are not pleased with our plans; they would hamper us in every possible way. They realize that we are building and extending Sovietism, and under Sovietism there is an end to their profits. But why, then, do they sell us machines at all? Because they want buyers of

their product and love money; because they must dispose of their goods. Ford, the American millionaire, expressed the (selfish, short-sighted and stupid) American attitude and policy when he said, 'It is difficult to refuse the dollar of to-day for tomorrow's dollar.' "

The old saying "A bird in hand is worth two in the bush" may at times, and under certain conditions, be a wise adage, but a long-headed, clear-thinking man and a loyal executive will give up a few dollars in the present to gain many dollars and retain honor, his company's and his country's well-being, with intensified prestige, in the future.

The Russian Soviets openly say and teach, "We must be independent of the calculations of Americans. We must at first buy their machines, then purchase from them machines for making their machines and, later, we will build all our own machines and all machines for making our machines, and building more machines than we need—far cheaper than any other country can produce them,—we will sell to other peoples and ultimately dominate and hold the markets of the world."

American short-sightedness, American avarice of the moment, American stupidity and American demagogism—with "party" criticism of everything said, done, or attempted—are disloyally and insidiously assisting definitely and most substantially to make Soviet Russia's diabolical dreams come true.

America—wake up! See straight and true, cut out politics and prejudice, and get clear-headed! Forget the littleness of the moment and of the one selfish phase or section, and think and work for the

whole United States of America—for all of its labor, its invested capital, its physical, mental and spiritual resources; its ideals of government, its humanity; its social justice; its partly realized (but still wholly hoped-for) democracy and individual freedom, and for the God of our fathers and of our real selves who, we know, “was, is, and ever will be,” and that long after destructive Sovietism has passed from the world and is remembered merely as a hideous dream or a devastating social plague.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



124 405

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY